

F 2256
Entw.

MANIFESTO

MANIFESTO

*Being the Book of
The Federation of Progressive
Societies and Individuals*

by

C·E·M·JOAD, ALLAN YOUNG
W·ARNOLD-FORSTER, FRANCIS
MEYNELL, W·OLAF STAPLEDON
JANET CHANCE, D·N·PRITT
CLOUGH WILLIAMS-ELLIS
G·M·BOUMPHREY, ARCHIBALD
ROBERTSON, J·C·FLUGEL

Edited by C·E·M·Joad

Introduction by
H·G·WELLS

LONDON
GEORGE ALLEN & UNWIN LTD
MUSEUM STREET

FIRST PUBLISHED IN 1934

All rights reserved

**PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
UNWIN BROTHERS LTD., WOKING**

CONTENTS

	PAGE
FOREWORD—THE EDITOR	7
INTRODUCTION: THERE SHOULD BE A COMMON CREED FOR LEFT PARTIES THROUGHOUT THE WORLD—H. G. WELLS	12
THE BASIS OF THE FEDERATION OF PROGRESSIVE SOCIETIES AND INDIVIDUALS	21
CHAPTER I	
THE F.P.S.I.: WHAT IT IS; WHAT IT WANTS; AND HOW IT HOPES TO OBTAIN IT C. E. M. JOAD	30
CHAPTER II	
THE ECONOMICS OF PLANNING—ALLAN YOUNG	64
CHAPTER III	
THE PRICE OF PEACE—DISARMAMENT AND WORLD GOVERNMENT—W. ARNOLD-FORSTER	88
CHAPTER IV	
WHAT SHALL I DO IN THE NEXT WAR? FRANCIS MEYNELL	114
CHAPTER V	
EDUCATION AND WORLD CITIZENSHIP W. OLAF STAPLEDON	142
CHAPTER VI	
REFORM OF THE SEX LAWS—JANET CHANCE	166

MANIFESTO**CHAPTER VII****REFORM OF THE CRIMINAL LAW****D. N. PRITT, K.C.****PAGE****184****CHAPTER VIII****OUR PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT****CLOUGH WILLIAMS-ELLIS, F.R.I.B.A.****216****CHAPTER IX****THE PRINCIPLES OF TOWN AND COUNTRY****PLANNING—G. M. BOUMPHREY****250****CHAPTER X****THE SECULARIZATION OF THE STATE AND****THE FREEDOM OF THE INDIVIDUAL****ARCHIBALD ROBERTSON****272****CHAPTER XI****A PSYCHOLOGY FOR PROGRESSIVES****J. C. FLUGEL****292****APPENDIX—MEMBERSHIP FORM****315****INDEX****317**

F O R E W O R D

by

THE EDITOR

THE assumption on the basis of which the Federation of Progressive Societies and Individuals (F.P.S.I.) was formed was the existence of a new agreement among progressively-minded persons upon certain fundamental issues. The innumerable currents of advanced opinion in the post-war world had, it was thought, tended of recent years to flow together into a more or less homogeneous stream. There was, in fact—or so we believed—a certain *crystallization* of progressive thought. In the light of this assumption a number of those who were considered to possess special knowledge of, or familiarity with, the various subjects enumerated in the F.P.S.I. Basis were invited to contribute papers of about five thousand words in length to a Federation Manifesto, each taking as the text of his contribution the relevant passage from the Basis. The supposition was that the various contributors would find themselves in agreement with the proposals made in their texts and would be able to devote themselves to amplifying, elucidating, and applying them to the circumstances of contemporary society, much as a preacher amplifies, elucidates, and applies—alas that misapplication should be only too often the appropriate word—the text he has chosen from the Bible. The results have sufficiently justified this assumption to make it possible to publish the resulting essays

without alteration as a Manifesto of the F.P.S.I. This does not mean that the book is an official *exposé* of the Federation's policy and programme, or that all the members of the Federation would agree with all of it, any more than it means that all the contributors to the book would be willing to subscribe to every opinion expressed by each of them. What it does mean is, first, that the supposition on the basis of which the F.P.S.I. was founded is in the main valid. "Write," I have said to X "on this," to Y "on that," anticipating with a reasonable degree of assurance both what they would say and that I should agree with it. Beyond the bare text of the Basis no indication was given of the lines which the contributors were to follow, of the proposals which they should make, or the conclusions which they should reach. They have written, accordingly, with a perfectly free hand, and the results are, taking them by and large, the results which I expected, and which, if I may say so without insulting these eminent contributors, any member of the F.P.S.I. who possessed the necessary knowledge, literary technique, and expository skill would have produced in their place. In this sense, then, and to this extent, the assumption of those of us who formed the F.P.S.I. that there is a new crystallization of advanced opinion has turned out to be correct.

It means, secondly, that the contributions as a whole reflect with sufficient faithfulness the known sentiments of the members of the F.P.S.I. to justify their presentation to the public as a fair statement of its social and political outlook and of the policy in which that outlook finds expression. The nature of that outlook, the outline of that policy, are indicated in my own contribution;

the need for them in Mr. Wells's Introduction; the detailed application of them in the contributions which follow. That the reader should not agree with all the proposals in our programme is inevitable. But the F.P.S.I. does not insist on complete agreement, nor is it interested in heresy hunting among its members. Postulating that the amount of agreement among progressive persons is large, and on important issues more impressive than their disagreement, it demands that action should be taken to give effect to the former on the basis of a tacit conspiracy to ignore the latter. Only in the economic sphere has experience shown our initial presupposition to be shaky. That we all want a planned economy and a reasonable method of distributing the goods that science enables us so embarrassingly to produce all are agreed. But how to get them?

The answer is far from clear. For this reason Allan Young's contribution on Economic Planning has been the most difficult to write; it will also command the least measure of agreement. This is no criticism of Mr. Young; indeed, I know of no writer who, refusing to commit himself to platitudes, would have commanded so much. But it affords an interesting sidelight on the state of economic opinion.

The question may be asked why two contributions are devoted to the subject of town and country planning, which constitutes one section, and that not the most important, of the Federation's Basis. The answer is first, because, while the subject is admittedly not more important than the others, its importance is perhaps less generally recognized; secondly, because the preservation of the beauty of England is the pet personal interest of

the editor; and thirdly, which is the real answer, that having commissioned a contribution from that prince of fighters in the field, Clough Williams-Ellis, I then heard Mr. G. M. Boumphrey give utterance to opinions which seemed to me at once so novel, so shocking, and so sound, that I could not resist the temptation of asking him to put them on paper. I hope that his readers will agree that I was right. The other contributions are self-explanatory, and the reader is accordingly commended to the writers to be bullied, cajoled, reasoned with, persuaded or convinced, according to their methods and his temperament. If he is in fact convinced, let him act accordingly and join the Federation of Progressive Societies and Individuals. This he can do by writing to the Secretary, Room 21, St. Stephen's House, Westminster, S.W.1.

C. E. M. JOAD

HAMPSTEAD

November 1933

INTRODUCTION

**THERE SHOULD BE A COMMON CREED
FOR LEFT PARTIES THROUGHOUT
ALL THE WORLD**

by

H. G. WELLS

INTRODUCTION

THERE SHOULD BE A COMMON CREED FOR LEFT PARTIES THROUGHOUT ALL THE WORLD

THERE is, I believe, a great and growing stir in the minds of men to fight the sombre destiny that hangs over humanity. The gathering distresses of our race, deepening economic misery, the unrelieved threat of war, and the lassitude of governments, are rousing a spirit which is in its essence revolutionary. Some of us who associate barricades in the street, crowd violence, and the butchering of defeated rulers with the word revolution, may boggle at it and prefer to say "reconstruction." Whichever word they use, the reality remains that the will for change is gathering as swiftly as summer thunder, and that many existing arrangements and institutions, from war-debts to frontiers, from national sovereignty to the private sovereignty of industrial and financial concerns, are threatened by the storm.

Mankind, the majority of mankind, is living in want and anxiety in the midst of such plenty as was never possible before, in danger and fear in the face of potential order and security. As the realization of this spreads throughout the world, impatience and revolt must increase and the revolutionary struggle, the struggle for a better governance of mankind, become more and more acute. The old order, the institutions in possession, the people who are still in positions of advantage and authority

amidst the general failure, are already bracing themselves for defence.

Now this gathering revolt against the world as it is is expressing itself in a multiplicity of forms. There is no one simple revolutionary movement. We have in Great Britain various Liberal and Labour organizations, a multitude of socialist initiatives, the Communists, and so forth, all seeking to change the world for the greater happiness of mankind, and incidentally doing their utmost to hinder and discredit each other's effort. The same confusion and waste of progressive effort appears in every other country to which we turn. The aim to make the world anew and nearer the heart's desire of mankind is universal, but the methods are generally local, sectarian, partisan, hysterical, and confused. The forces of protest and reconstruction are in the aggregate enormous, but they go largely to waste in a sort of civil war among themselves. They provoke defence and do not overcome it. They neutralize each other and they allow themselves to be beaten in detail by the forces of reaction. They seem unable even to arrest the creeping approach of another war in Europe. They are wasted not through lack of emotion and will, but, I submit, through confusion of mind. They misunderstand each other—obstinately. They misunderstand themselves. Could we rally them now, not necessarily to organized unity, but to a world-wide co-operation towards a clearly defined end, we might, I believe, count this the Year One of a new world.

Now it seems to me that the necessary first step towards such a creative rally in human affairs would be a statement of the aims upon which all liberal-minded

and socially constructive men throughout the world can agree. Without such a plain statement revolutionary action can never be constructively revolutionary. It will remain blindly insurrectionary. It will degenerate into hysterical destructiveness. It will drive over masses of potential helpers towards repression. The new world will not dawn.

But is such a statement, such a fundamental creed, possible? I believe it is. I believe a common creed of progress can be formulated now, and I believe an immense economy and accession of creative power would ensue upon the general acceptance of such a creed. For the last few months I have been studying all sorts of progressive and revolutionary plans and projects, and trying over a series of drafts to embody in the most sweeping terms that I could find, sweepingly but clearly and definitely, just what should be the essential drive of effort at the present time. I have been asking what we of the left want, and trying to work out the greatest common denominator of the whole. The agreement upon realities I find immense; the differences are differences of sentiment, feeling, strategy, and suspicion. I have submitted a series of drafts, beginning with very crude and unsatisfactory stuff indeed, to scores of various and representative people, and I have weighed every criticism, and rephrased and rephrased it again, whenever it was found to be vague, weak, or unsound. And here is what I have made of it.

It is a statement of the aims and the strategy of world reconstruction. It is a double-barrelled instrument. There is (*a*) a statement, first, of the common aims and (*b*) of—what shall I call it?—fundamental revolutionary

strategy. Necessarily it is a socialist project, necessarily it is pacifist and demands a World Pax. So far, indeed, as aims go, I believe the whole body of revolutionary feeling and effort is agreed. But upon the question of strategy the summary I am offering here comes into conflict with one very vocal section of left opinion, the old-fashioned class-war western communist, just as much as it comes into conflict with the blind reaction of the right, and the sentimentalities and loyalties of patriotism and imperialism. I write western communist deliberately. Much of that old-fashioned stuff has been repudiated in practice in Russia, but it still screams and shouts and flounders about, an unmitigated nuisance wherever the revolutionary spirit assembles in Europe and America, confusing the young and dividing counsel. We who want to see a new world arise out of the tottering fabric of the old are bound to take up this issue of the class war. We have to get our minds clear as between the easy futilities of insurrectionism and the more difficult but more hopeful effort of progressive construction.

But first let me state what I believe are

THE COMMON OBJECTIVES OF PROGRESSIVE WORLD EFFORT

I. The scientific development of the actual and potential resources of the world and the distribution of the resulting wealth to provide the fullest and most vigorous life possible for the whole species. This necessarily involves:

1. The progressive replacement of production for private profit by collective production, and with this the development of a competent direction for collective enterprise as rapidly as it can be organized.

2. The establishment of a world system of money and credit that will ensure a practical steadiness of purchasing power in the money earned by the worker and guard the community against the persistence and aggravation of debt. Money exists for man and not man for money, and in human society, as it is constituted at present, the strangulation and distortion of life by a traditional and imperfectly understood finance is an ever-present evil that has to be brought to an end.

II. The organization of a World Pax to end war, secure the disappearance of armaments and the complete suppression of the private manufacture of weapons, with the diversion to collective creative work of the energy thus released and the progressive abrogation of national sovereignty in favour of world controls.

III. The modernization of education throughout the world so as to ensure to every human being the necessary knowledge and ideas and the necessary habit of service, for conscious willing and competent co-operation in the human commonweal.

IV. The establishment and preservation of free speech, free publication, and the right of free movement throughout the world.

Is that what we want or is it not? It is no answer to flick adjectives at the statement and say that it is Utopian, remote, idealistic, and so forth. A man who is famishing in a desert wants food and drink, and it does not help him to say that such a desire is Utopian, remote, etc., and to offer him, as a practical man, a nice handful of sand. However desperate it is, the only rational course before him is to try to get food and drink before he perishes. And is there anything else wrong with that general statement? I think you will find it covers the whole field of progressive effort. You may find it not explicit

enough for your taste, but I think you will find anything you may feel keen upon in the industrial, educational, political, or other field, implicit therein.

And next as to strategy. How are we to get towards these aims? Here also I submit certain general propositions that have also been most carefully criticized and revised. They are not so sure of acceptance as that statement of aims; they have battled their way through a multitude of discussions with a number of people, but I fancy anyone who reads them for what they are will find them giving the right form for the general advance towards the new world.

THE STRATEGY OF PROGRESSIVE WORLD EFFORT

I. In the present multifarious complexity of human affairs it is impracticable to attempt to achieve the objects already stated by one single creative revolutionary organization. It is necessary to marshal a great variety of forces and prepare for a great variety of activities.

II. One powerful drive towards the new world is to be found in the organization and direction of the natural resentment of the disinherited masses. This organization and direction is what is known as the Class War. A war is an effort to attain an objective and not an objective in itself. It may supply immense driving force towards the reconstruction of human affairs. But as the objectives of the revolutionary world effort are approached, the Class War will diminish and finally disappear in the achievement of a classless society.

III. Equally important already is that passion for achievement and righteousness that leads human beings to devote themselves to the studied replanning of social functions, production, distribution, education, science, and the like. The impulse to replan is inseparable from the impulse to

carry out the plan. Planning has its own driving force. This motive is potentially as powerful in most human beings as the drive for monetary gain, and it is a main defect of the present social system that the former is discouraged relatively to the latter. The creative motive demands organization to rescue the world from private profit seeking. The instinctive realization of this necessity already finds expression in a variety of more or less disciplined and instructed associations from the Communist Party to the various Fascist associations. Such "efficiency" organizations are a necessary factor for world revolution. The actual organizations may be of various types and ranges; they may overlap with each other and the political class war organization; there is no reason for an artificial and possibly entangling unification so long as they are all in agreement as to the objectives of progressive effort already stated. They will grow in importance and courage to become the living body of the new order. The planned and planning revolutionary organization increases in importance as the insurrectionary movement fades out.

Here I submit is a common basis and a common strategy on which all the progressive movements of the earth could agree at the present time. It excludes all personal devotion royalists, nationalists, militarists, economic and financial individualists, and, indeed, every type of reactionary. It will oblige the intelligent communist to think, and the reactionary communist to blaspheme and show his essentially reactionary quality. It is as acceptable to an intelligent man or woman in China or Chili as it is in Moscow or Glasgow. It may not appear to be "practical politics" to many; it may not seem to be close up to all the issues of to-day; but it is closer than many suppose. It supplies a criterion by which all contemporary politics can be judged and a general statement of direction to which every movement should be oriented.

So, at least, it appears to me. I publish this report on what I have talked out with a very varied selection of people. It is my attempt to record the progressive movement up to date. But it is no more than a draft based on discussion with that selection of people. It may need extensions or qualifications that I do not realize. If so, let us hammer it out again. Let it have appendices and footnotes so long as they do not smother it. Let it be re-written so long as it is not rewritten out of sight. But of the urgent necessity at the present time, for such a compact credo, that can go into all languages and supply a common basis of action and reference, I am profoundly convinced. The forces of world construction are lamentably scattered. They are troops without map or compass. They have no general scheme of action, and that is one of the primary reasons why we still live, needy, unhappy, and in great danger, in the midst of potential abundance and security.

THE BASIS OF THE FEDERATION OF PROGRESSIVE SOCIETIES AND INDIVIDUALS

ROOM 21, ST. STEPHEN'S HOUSE, WESTMINSTER
Telephone: WHITEHALL 2408

THE PRESIDENT AND THE VICE-PRESIDENTS OF THE FEDERATION OF PROGRESSIVE SOCIETIES AND INDIVIDUALS

December 1933

President.

C. E. M. Joad

Vice-Presidents.

Oliver Baldwin.	Kingsley Martin
Gerald Barry	A. S. Neill.
Vera Brittain.	Beverley Nicols.
Lionel Britton.	Harold Nicolson.
Professor Cyril Burt.	Bertrand Russell.
Professor J. C. Flugel.	Olaf Stapledon.
Dr. Norman Haire.	H. G. Wells.
Aldous Huxley.	Geoffrey West.
Julian Huxley.	Rebecca West.
David Low.	Leonard Woolf.
Miles Malleson.	Barbara Wootton.

The Federation of Progressive Societies and Individuals exists to promote contact and co-operation between societies and individuals working towards social and economic reconstruction, with a view to increasing the effectiveness of their efforts.

The chaos of international relations, the failure to balance production and consumption, the nationalist policies pursued by governments with their appeals to fear, greed and self-interest under the guise of patriotism, must, unless arrested, inevitably lead, through social demoralization and tariff and military wars, to the breakdown of civilization.

One of the most alarming features of the present drift of affairs is that while the forces of reaction are compact, well organized, and well disciplined, those which stand for rational progress are scattered, disorganized, and impotent. A large number of separate societies, insignificant in size and limited in scope to this or that particular object, cannot hope to produce much effect on public opinion when confronted with the wealthy and powerful interests which control the platform, the pulpit, and the press.

The Federation starts from the assumption that, in regard to certain issues, there exists sufficient agreement among progressive societies and individuals to make a large-scale offensive a possibility. The function of the Federation, therefore, is to bring together and to organize these elements of agreement which undoubtedly exist, but which at present lack a common platform and objective. By inducing as many societies and individuals as possible to work for an all-round progressive programme, the Federation seeks to show the common philosophical background of all progressive thought, and to give concrete expression to this background by common effort in practical work. The policy of the Federation includes the following:

I. ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL

1. REGIONAL AND WORLD PLANNING with a view to
 - (a) The progressive replacement of production for profit by production for use as rapidly as competent collective direction can be organized.
 - (b) The scientific development of the actual and potential resources of the world.
 - (c) The distribution of the resulting wealth to provide the fullest and most vigorous life possible for the whole species.
 - (d) The setting up of world economic research and statistical centres to elaborate and direct a world plan.
2. THE REORGANIZATION OF FINANCE, including
 - (a) The establishment of a world banking organization and a world currency.
 - (b) The alleviation of creditor burdens, involving the cancellation of war debts and reparations.
 - (c) The ultimate establishment of central control of the distribution of raw materials in order to stabilize world prices.
3. THE SETTING UP OF A WORLD GOVERNMENT, necessarily involving
 - (a) The disappearance of armaments and the complete suppression of the private manufacture of weapons, with the diversion to creative work of the energy thus released.
 - (b) The progressive abrogation of national sovereignty as world authorities are brought into being.

Among first steps this involves (i) progressive disarmament by example on the part of this country, and (ii) war resistance on the part of individuals in the event of an outbreak of hostilities.

II. EDUCATIONAL**i. THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A UNIVERSAL SYSTEM OF EDUCATION, including**

- (a) State provision of adequate facilities for higher education.
- (b) Demilitarization and secularization of existing schools.
- (c) Inclusion in the school curriculum of instruction in
 - (i) general biology, covering sex education and hygiene, (ii) world economics and finance, (iii) universal as opposed to national history.

III. SOCIAL**i. SEXUAL QUESTIONS**

THE RELEASE OF PERSONAL CONDUCT FROM ALL TABOOS AND RESTRICTIONS EXCEPT THOSE IMPOSED IN THE INTEREST OF THE WEAK AND THE YOUNG. This would include

- (a) Legislation to secure (i) reform of the Divorce Laws, (ii) legalization of abortion, with proper safeguards, (iii) abolition of the laws penalizing abnormality, (iv) provision of facilities for voluntary sterilization.
- (b) Adequate provision of information on and facilities for birth control.

2. LAW REFORM

MODERNIZATION OF CRIMINAL AND CIVIL LAW AND PROCEDURE, including

- (a) Abolition of capital and merely retributive punishment.
- (b) Provision for the segregation and remedial treatment of socially harmful individuals.

3. TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING, WITH THE OBJECT OF MAINTAINING AND IMPROVING PUBLIC AMENITIES, PRESERVING THE WILD PLACES, SAFEGUARDING THE BEAUTY OF THE COUNTRYSIDE, AND SECURING THESE FOR THE ENJOYMENT OF ALL. Immediate steps to this end would include

- (a) Provision of National Parks.
- (b) Passage into law of proposals such as those contained in "The Access to Mountains Bill."
- (c) Slum Clearance.

4. CIVIL AND RELIGIOUS LIBERTIES

THE SECURING FOR THE INDIVIDUAL OF THE MOST COMPLETE FREEDOM OF CONDUCT AND SELF-EXPRESSION THAT IS CONSISTENT WITH THE COMMON WELFARE. This involves

- (a) Abolition of literary, dramatic, and film censorship.
- (b) Abolition of restrictions relating to dress, drink, Sunday observance, and freedom of speech.
- (c) Disestablishment and disendowment of all State Churches.
- (d) Abolition of the Blasphemy Laws.

It is proposed that the following shall be included among the activities of the Federation:

1. Maintenance of headquarters with a view to centralizing the work of the constituent societies so far as may be expedient.
2. The holding of periodical conferences, week-end schools, meetings, etc.
3. Organization of lectures and a panel of speakers.
4. The encouragement and assistance of local groups and study circles with a view to their participation in the work of the Federation.
5. The organization of a reciprocal publicity service.
6. Organized pressure on Ministers, M.P.s, Parliamentary and Municipal Candidates and Public Authorities in regard to questions in which the Federation is interested.
7. Organization of a Research Bureau, Commissions of Investigation and Press Publicity on such questions.

8. The issue of pamphlets, a Monthly Journal,¹ and a Year Book, chronicling the activities of the Federation and of constituent societies.
9. Co-operation with similar organizations in other countries with a view to the mobilizing of world opinion.

The Federation seeks the support of all who realize the vital importance of mobilizing and directing public opinion on the foregoing issues and of bringing legislation into line with enlightened thought. Whilst it is hoped that all who are sympathetic with the Federation's aims will become members, it should at the same time be borne in mind that the work of the Federation will be directed towards action rather than discussion. The Federation is organizing a body of workers prepared to discipline and actively to devote themselves to the realization of its aims, and is desirous of inducing as many members as possible to undertake some kind of practical work in one of the ways indicated.

MEMBERSHIP

Full MEMBERSHIP is open to all who are in agreement with the Federation's aims and accept its basis.

At the same time, the Federation welcomes as ASSOCIATES those who are in agreement with some part of its aims, but who do not feel able to accept the whole basis. Associateship does not convey the right to vote at the meetings of the Federation.

SUBSCRIPTIONS

The MINIMUM subscription for both members and associates

¹ *Plan.* Subscriptions (3/- per annum for members, 3/6 for non-members) are payable to the Editor, J. W. M. Dudding, Room 21, St. Stephen's House, Westminster, S.W.1. *All members of the Federation are urged to subscribe to "Plan."*

The Twentieth Century is published Quarterly (price 1/-) and embodies the cultural side of the Federation's policy.

is 5s. per annum. The financial year of the Federation is from July 1st to June 30th. The MINIMUM subscription for members and associates joining after January 1st and before June 30th is 2s. 6d. for the current financial year concerned.

AT THE PRESENT TIME THE FEDERATION IS IN PARTICULARLY URGENT NEED OF FUNDS IN ORDER TO PROVIDE THE NECESSARY STAFF AND EQUIPMENT FOR THE INITIAL STAGES OF ITS WORK, AND IT IS HOPED THAT THOSE WHOSE CIRCUMSTANCES PERMIT WILL PAY AN INCREASED SUBSCRIPTION IN PROPORTION TO THEIR MEANS.

The minimum subscription for life membership is 5 guineas.

INDIVIDUALS desiring to join the Federation are requested to apply to the Secretary, F.P.S.I., Room 21, St. Stephen's House, Westminster, S.W.1.

SOCIETIES desirous of affiliating are requested to apply to the Secretary for particulars.

CHAPTER I

THE F.P.S.I.: WHAT IT IS; WHAT IT WANTS; AND HOW IT HOPES TO OBTAIN IT

by

C. E. M. JOAD

(First President of the F.P.S.I.)

CHAPTER I

THE F.P.S.I.: WHAT IT IS; WHAT IT WANTS; AND HOW IT HOPES TO OBTAIN IT

I. How the F.P.S.I. was formed

THE NEW AGREEMENT AMONG PROGRESSIVES

Early in 1932 a group of men representing different societies of the kind which are usually considered "advanced" met to consider what changes they could agree to be necessary in the fabric of law and public opinion, if our civilization is to advance, "or rather," as somebody insisted on amending, "if our civilization is to survive." The laws and conventions governing the relations between the sexes are, it seemed obvious to all, savage and absurd. Divorce should be conceded to those who want it on the same terms as marriage; it should, that is to say, be enough that both parties want it. Birth-control information and facilities should be made available for all, and not merely for the well-to-do; the ferocious laws penalizing abortion mitigated, if not abolished; the congenitally unfit sterilized.

In the international sphere it was agreed that the immediate need was for disarmament; disarmament, that is, by example. If war came, it was the duty of the individual to resist it. In the long run the only hope for the peace of the world lay, it was thought, in the supersession of individual national sovereignties by a sovereign League of Nations backed by an international

force. The political national state of to-day is, in fact, an anachronism in an economically international world. That people should be permitted to write and say, to read and see what they please, is an elementary requirement of an adult civilization. Compliance means the repeal of the blasphemy laws and the abolition of the censorship of books, plays, and films. All again were agreed on the removal of the vestigial restrictions surviving from the Puritanism of the Victorian age, restrictions upon drink, dress (or rather undress), and amusements, especially Sunday amusements. If we are to preserve what is left of our heritage of natural beauty there must, we thought, be comprehensive "amenities" legislation, including the provision of national parks, planning and control of building, and access to mountains and wild places for walkers, irrespective of the needs of "sportsmen." Our agreement extended even to economics. We agreed, that is to say, upon the need for a planned as opposed to a haphazard economy, and an equitable rationing of the national income as ends, although inevitable differences arose as to means.

Now, this consensus of agreement is, I submit, a rather surprising thing. That it is real any reader of this book may discover for himself by noting his own concurrence in the measures I have mentioned (I am sufficiently confident of my thesis to assume the concurrence) and by testing the opinions of his friends. Not only is it real; it is new. There has been a crystallization of opinion among advanced people in the last few years, and the agreement which I confidently postulate to-day would not have been there before the war, or in 1921, or even in 1925.

THIS AGREEMENT INARTICULATE

But, although there is agreement in the realm of thought, no steps whatever are taken to give it substance in the world of fact. Moreover, it is extraordinarily difficult to obtain publicity even for the fact of its existence in thought; not only would none of the official organs of public opinion—popular press and pulpit, platform and radio, the organs which first form the public taste and then defend themselves for catering for it on the ground that they are only giving the public what it wants—endorse it, but they would be horrified to their respectable marrows by the mere suggestion that they should. Suggest to the Labour Party a definite line on birth control, or to one of the great dailies that it should advocate the legalization of abortion and it will begin to rumble with shocked indignation, as if it were the national bowels. Thus, at the moment, there is a gulf between what does duty officially as public opinion and the new crystallization of advanced opinion, a gulf which was never wider than to-day.

AND POWERLESS

The powerlessness of this body of agreement is equally obvious. Indeed, it may plausibly be urged that there was never a time when “intellectuals” pulled less weight in the affairs and counsels of the nation, the fact that usage compels me to print a perfectly honourable title in inverted commas being a fair measure of the estimation in which they are held. London is honeycombed with societies for the propagation of this and the abolition of that. Their members meet weekly or monthly twenty or thirty strong, invite eminent persons to address them,

read papers, discuss them, and go home. Occasionally they hold conferences and pass resolutions, which may be forwarded to responsible bodies.

These conferences often take place at week-end schools, where members of the society, having been addressed by a celebrity lecturer, are elevated to such a pitch of "progressive" excitement by the opportunities for eating, drinking, and generally hob-nobbing with him which the week-end affords, that they go back to their normal avocations on the Monday morning complacently regarding themselves as pioneers of progress and architects of a new world. Occasionally the society will publish a pamphlet or even beget a book. . . . Most of the societies hold a yearly summer school where the members meet, happily and communally, at bed and board. The summer school is the crown of the society's year. . . .

Now all these activities are no doubt very pleasant and enjoyable, but for any influence which they exert on the course of public affairs, those engaged in them might just as well cultivate roses or play spillikins. However much they may differ in the nature of their aims, all the societies in question have certain common features; they are small, they preach only to the converted, their literature is read only by their members, and not always by them, and they are politically and socially impotent. Their effect upon legislation is nil, and the machinations of statesmen proceed to their appointed ends with a contemptuous indifference to their propaganda, if, indeed, one can be said to be indifferent to that of whose existence one is unaware. If all the advanced societies which exist in London were abolished to-morrow,

I do not believe that the passage of events would be affected one iota.

HARMLESS INDULGENCES OF INTELLECTUALS

Now this cerebrating and discussing in public is well enough in normal times. It is creditable to the public spirit and interest of those who participate, and, so far as I can see, it does no harm to anybody else, even if it does no good. The times, however, are peculiar; our civilization shows manifest signs of disintegration, and, unless the present drift of events is arrested, it may drift to its destruction. And inevitably the questions present themselves: "Given the existing situation, are these societies for intellectual self-indulgence resulting in political impotence good enough? Or, may it not be the duty of those who have been so long and pleasantly 'advanced' in private to try seriously to mobilize opinion on behalf of the measures which they deem essential—to influence in fact the trend of public policy?" To do this they must unite. But for the intellectual the task of co-operating with other intellectuals for the achievement of specific public objects is formidable. Of the difficulties with which it is beset two are outstanding.

DISTASTE FOR ORGANIZATION AND INCAPACITY FOR UNITY

There is the difficulty of temperament and aptitude. Members of advanced societies possess intellectual energy and interest and sometimes knowledge. Sensitive to new ideas, they are apt at exposition and criticism; for many the ventilation of ideas is, indeed, a form, at once accessible and irreproachable, of self-indulgence, public-spirited talk providing for the intelligentsia the

outlet or anodyne (call it which you please) that sport, drink, or drugs do for other classes. But aptitude for discussion does not connote the possession of the qualities which are necessary to implement its conclusions. The tasks which are required of those who would translate private convictions into public practice are lobbying and letter-writing, organizing and committee work, even on occasion envelope-addressing and stamp-licking. These tasks require a capacity for sustained effort and a willingness not to be bored. Not only has the intellectual no special aptitude in these directions, but the qualities in which he excels tend to unfit him for the performance of propaganda work by rendering him incapable of tolerating monotonous jobs.

Secondly, there is the difficulty of self-esteem. Each cock likes to crow on its own intellectual dunghill. A man who shines in a small society is dimmed in a large organization. Vanities are wounded and enjoyment curtailed. Moreover, each society is apt to have one or two "pet" objects which it regards as of supreme importance. If societies combine, there must be accommodation not only among members but among "pet" objects, and one must consent to seeing one's own special short cut to the millennium scheduled as only one among a number of doubtfully practicable routes.

It would be foolish to minimize these difficulties. If you do not propose to achieve your ends by force—and at that game the intellectual will always be beaten by the clumsy lout—co-operative propaganda is the only method at your disposal. Yet intellectuals are singularly little given to co-operation. The over-developed individualities of progressive persons make them singu-

larly averse from common action. They are still, most of them, in the throes of their revolt against experiences of common action "enjoyed" in the regiment or at the public school. Yet danger may effect union where common sense has failed. One of the most alarming features of the present situation is the contrast between the disunity, disorganization, and impotence of the forces that make for reasoned progress and the compactness and efficiency of those that stand for reaction. Ask any M.P., when any proposal for progressive legislation is "on the tapis," how many postcards he receives from one side and how many from the other!

THE F.P.S.I. AS MAID-OF-ALL-WORK

It is precisely this danger which has called into being the Federation of Progressive Societies to give unity and cohesion to those woefully impotent forces. It seeks less to put forward a programme of its own than to establish an organization for implementing the programmes of the various scattered societies whose aims it incorporates, and whose affiliation it invites.

Its object is not to supersede but to supplement the efforts of these societies. It would assist their propaganda by meetings, by letters to the Press, by the exertion of pressure on M.P.s and local authorities, and by personal canvas and effort in support of the objects which they seek to promote, which are also its own. From this point of view it may be conceived as a maid-of-all-work to progressive causes of every kind.

It is, then, primarily a movement for bringing together and amalgamating. It would seek to fulfil the humble function of glue, binding together in a coherent and effec-

tive mass the multitude of scattered units which to-day constitute the forces of progress. In the brief period of its history it has provided a common platform for progressive speakers of all shades of opinion; it has held conferences and meetings in support of the various sections of its manifesto; it has organized letter-writing to the press and the badgering of M.P.s. In multitudinous ways it has sought to serve the causes of peace, of world-government, and of sexual enlightenment, and to hasten the coming of a planned and ordered commonwealth.

ITS METHODS CONSTITUTIONAL

The Federation of Progressive Societies and Individuals is, it is obvious, a strictly constitutional body. Its methods, no less than its objectives, presuppose the existence of a society in which freedom of speech and writing is the prerogative of every citizen, in which the right of public assembly is unquestioned, and every individual is at liberty not only to comment upon the course of events, but to seek, so far as his powers run, to influence them. This background of an ordered democratic society exists in this country to-day. Over large areas of the Continent, however, it has already disappeared, and there are many who believe that under the accumulating stresses of our time its disappearance may be looked for in England as well at no distant date. If this is the case, such a body as the Federation of Progressive Societies and Individuals is doomed to futility in the present and extinction in the future. I propose, therefore, very briefly to examine the considerations which increasingly lead competent observers to take this view and to see how far they are well grounded.

II. The Diagnosis of Despair

THE DRIFT OF CONTEMPORARY EVENTS

Since the Federation was formed in the spring of 1932 the world situation—the fact is, alas, too clear—has grown progressively worse. As the situation has deteriorated, the aims which the Federation exists to promote have grown progressively more difficult of realization. We set out to appeal against the accumulating stresses of our time to the sanity of the world. With the prospect of an ampler, richer way of life than mankind has known opening out before our race, we appealed to the men of our generation not to allow nationalist passion to blind them to their opportunity, or to let economic folly dissipate the gifts of science. We sought, in fact, to throw down a deliberate challenge to human rationality. All these things which we advocate are, we insist, strictly reasonable; we will, in fact, undertake to prove to you that by adopting our programme human beings will become healthier and happier, that their lives will be in every way saner and cleaner and better than they are at present.

And, assuming that there were ears to hear, most of us could have made good our undertaking. The assumption we took for granted. Yet it grows increasingly questionable, for the world to whose sanity we proposed to appeal grows increasingly insane, while the collective reason of mankind, which we sought to challenge, so far from being roused to the pride of constructive achievement, seems increasingly incapable of averting the palpable drift of our civilization towards war and revolution, so that, surveying the world scene to-day, one

gets a sense of a civilization drifting guideless to catastrophe, a mere cork upon the waves of hidden forces which proceed to their appointed ends unaffected by the cerebrations of statesmen in council no less than by the propaganda of the F.P.S.I. To discern the operations of these underlying forces through the multitudinous complexity of the phenomena of our time in which they find expression, is to live in the world of a Hardy novel, where human beings are puppets twitched into weal and woe by an unseen showman who pulls the strings. Or again, it is like watching some enormous engine which, having left the rails, lumbers masterless to its destruction. Fascinated by the spectacle of an oncoming doom which he is unable to avert, the watcher finds himself, according to his temperament, impelled to advocate, even to undertake action without plan—he acts not because what he does seems to him right, but because it seems right to do something—or subsiding into a fatalistic mood of resignation without serenity.

SLUMP, WAR, AND HITLER

Three events in particular have contributed to produce the current pessimism in regard to the future of our society. First, in spite of economic conferences, the economic situation shows, it is said, little real sign of improvement. The paradox of want in the midst of plenty continues. On a rough estimate between 25 and 30 millions of men are out of work in Europe and America. The stream of international trade, the life-blood of the world economic system, has dwindled to a tiny trickle, while the resistance power of the capitalist system has been palpably weakened by four and a half years of slow decay.

In spite of the Disarmament Conference, the world still prepares visibly for war. The Conference has, indeed, at the time of writing, gone into cold storage. Its maximum hope seems to be not that of diminishing armaments, but of stabilizing them at their present level. Even this hope seems unlikely to be realized. Meanwhile the burden of armaments grows instead of diminishing. Our own country spent last year 110 million pounds in preparation for the next war, which is about 40 millions more than we spent in any single year before we had finally put an end to war by winning the war to end it. The other nations do not lag behind. On the contrary....

Thirdly, the Hitler counter-revolution in Germany has succeeded in stamping out such concrete realization of the ideals for which the Federation stands as our civilization has, up to the present, managed to achieve. Free thought and free speech in politics and religion, together with the radicalists and rationalists who sought to promote them, education in the schools in the facts of sex and the principles of world citizenship, together with the teachers who gave it, equality of opportunity for women, and the women who have taken advantage of it to make their mark in the world, have been ruthlessly suppressed. The ideals are derided, the individuals who sought to realize them are exiled, imprisoned, starved, murdered, tortured. For the use of reasoned argument, which, during the slow centuries of man's increasing civilization, has been coming to supplant the methods of physical force as the accepted instrument of persuasion, the Nazis have substituted the most horrible forms of physical violence, and seek by the infliction of

gross physical agony to endear their opinions to those who have ventured to disagree with them. Contemplating Hitler's Germany, one gets a sense of deliberate revolt against civilization. "The clumsy louts," as Mr. Wells has called them, have taken the field against thought, against culture, against freedom. They have had enough of progress, and, if they can stop it, they will.

THE DISILLUSIONED IDEALIST

Taking the world situation by and large, the dispassionate observer might well be justified in wondering whether contemporary human beings are not, after all, incorrigible; whether their civilization is not already past saving, and whether efforts to save it may not be morally mistaken as well as practically futile. Is it not, he may well be tempted to ask, a mistake to preserve a system which, engendering so much stupidity and folly, inflicts so much cruelty and injustice? Whether a dispassionate observer might or might not be tempted to put these questions, interested participants do put them increasingly, and, answering them in a sense unfavourable to our civilization, declare themselves unable or unwilling to lift a finger to save it from its richly deserved fate. This mood of the disillusioned idealist currently expresses itself in one or other of two attitudes. Either he becomes a revolutionary and, accepting the fact that change must of necessity be violent, enlists for the destruction of the system he condemns, enlists, that is to say, in sentiment, if not in fact, in the army of Communism; or else he subsides into fatalism, and, metaphorically washing his hands of events which he can no longer aspire to control, seeks to extract from art, literature, or personal

relations such enjoyment as he can contrive before the inevitable crash comes.

It is, it must be admitted, difficult at times not to share this latter mood. I have devoted the past two months to the reading of three books, each written by a competent observer, dealing with the immediate future of our civilization. The first, *The Menace of Fascism*, by John Strachey, prophesies—and gives good reason for the prophecy—the establishment of a Fascist dictatorship in England, unless the Labour Movement displays a quite unprecedented capacity for leadership. The second, *Cry Havoc*, by Beverley Nichols, envisages the destruction of our civilization by approaching war. The third, *The Shape of Things to Come*, by H. G. Wells, the greatest prophet of them all, anticipates the collapse of the societies of the Western world, as we know them, under the accumulated pressure of war and economic dislocation. Now, I defy anybody to read these three books one after the other, as I did, and not to conclude them in a mood of gloom, so profound, so rich in texture and universal in sweep as to be touched with something of the nobility of emotion we experience on beholding a tragedy of Sophocles or of Shakespeare. We are all for destruction, it seems! Very well, then, let us defy the Fates and face our doom like men.

In the light of this mood, this very understandable mood of so many intellectuals to-day, the aims of the F.P.S.I. cannot but seem childishly Utopian, its propaganda wholly irrelevant. Is there, one may well wonder, any ground, in spite of the diagnosis of experts and the warnings of the prophets, for its belief that reason still counts in human affairs, that men may still be persuaded

to improve instead of destroying their society, and that civilization may still turn the corner and insensibly transform itself into something finer and better than man has yet known? If there is not, such bodies as the F.P.S.I. are wasting their time; their propaganda is a ploughing of the sand; their activities those of children playing on the edge of a volcano whose eruption is about to smother them.

III. Counter-Diagnosis in Terms of Incorrigible Optimism

It would be foolish to seek in a few thousand words to reply to the formidable case contained in such books as those to which I have referred, as foolish as to minimize the gravity of the situation they portray. Nevertheless, there are, I think, certain considerations which may be urged in favour of a somewhat different analysis, yielding a somewhat different interpretation, and, as I, for one, am prepared to concede that, if the two moods fashionably current of revolutionary intransigence or fatalistic resignation are the only ones justified by the facts, the F.P.S.I. might very well put up the shutters and prepare for the deluge, I propose very briefly to indicate some of the more immediately obvious. Upon what factors, then, would one who, in spite of the evidence to the contrary, persists in his belief in the power of human sanity to control the situation, lay stress?

THE ECONOMIC SITUATION

Prominent among the interpretations, whose advocates are particularly liable to convict the propaganda of such a body as the F.P.S.I. of futility, is the Communist

interpretation in terms of the overriding importance of economic factors. Political and social, even moral and aesthetic phenomena are, according to the Communist analysis, by-products of economic events, mere flotsam and jetsam thrown up on the waves of the economic ground-swell. At the moment the prevailing ground-swell is that of Capitalism in decline. Nothing, it is said, can ultimately prevent, although circumstances may temporarily arrest, this decline. The financial collapse of 1929 in America, the crisis of 1931 in England, the slump which at the time of writing has persisted for four years and, it is urged, shows no signs of lifting, are all symptoms of, or more properly necessary stages in the process. The decline being inevitable and proceeding to inevitable collapse, any attempt to improve our social structure on the assumption that it will persist in anything like the form in which we have known it is a waste of time.

But is it, in fact, the case that the depression shows no signs of lifting? In the latter half of 1933—I am concerned here with this country only—trade began to improve. The volume both of exports and imports increased. Wool, cotton, iron, coal, steel, and electrical engineering took a turn for the better; railway receipts for the first time for years showed an improvement over the corresponding period of the preceding year. A surplus of revenue over expenditure was being confidently anticipated. Most important of all, the number of the unemployed had diminished by over half a million since the beginning of the year, and the number of persons actually employed was over 800,000 more than it had been a year ago.

Now I am quite aware that this improvement may be

a flash in the pan,¹ that it may not continue, that it is not world-wide, that it ought not to have happened at all, and that there are probably statisticians, the ingenuity of whose computations alone places them beyond my comprehension, who would be quite capable of proving to me that it has not happened at all.

Nevertheless, the fact is that one-fifth of the total number of the unemployed in England have been wiped out in a year. If, then, we are to insist on the fundamental importance of economic factors for our interpretation, if economic changes are, in fact, the key to the whole situation, ought we not to pay some attention to these highly important events in making our diagnosis? Ought we not to show here and now *why* they have no bearing on the prediction of the ultimate collapse of the Capitalist economic structure? I do not wish to over-emphasize the importance of these recent economic events; merely to assert that they place the onus of proof on those who do consistently ignore them, or, if they can be forced to attend to them, dismiss them as being of no importance whatever.

DEMOCRACY AND DICTATORSHIP

It is currently said that democracy has failed, is failing, and will fail increasingly, and that in due course it will be superseded by dictatorship. Up to the present, it is said, it has only been permitted to function on sufferance because the political democratic system has not really threatened the Capitalist structure of society. Directly the democracy throws up a Labour majority which means

¹ April 1934. It is still proceeding, and shows every sign of continuing to do so.

business and sets about the job of introducing Socialism, unconstitutional resistance from the right will upset the parliamentary apple-cart, and a reactionary dictatorship will take its place. This general analysis of the situation is applied with considerable effect to a reading of the immediate future in England. In three years' time another election will be due. Let us assume that the slump continues, that unemployment is still rife, that dissatisfaction with the National Government arising from its failure to fulfil pledges and sharpened by the administration of the Means Test renders likely the return of a Labour majority bent on the introduction of Socialism.

One of two things, it is said, will happen. Either the existing National Government will declare a state of national emergency in which it is stated to be undesirable in the national interests to hold an election, and continue to govern indefinitely without troubling itself to seek a fresh mandate from the electorate; or, assuming an election to be held and resulting in a Labour Government which embarks on a programme of Socialist measures, then, if the veto of the House of Lords is not in itself sufficient to reduce the Government to impotence, there would follow in rapid succession a flight of capital from the country, the depreciation of the pound, obstruction by the Civil Service, and in the last resort armed resistance by the forces of the Crown backed by middle and upper-class support, encouraged by the press, and led by officers who are the spiritual descendants of the men who supported Sir Edward Carson against the Asquith Government in 1914, before which the Labour Government would go down like a pack of cards. So much for Democracy. . . .

SOCIALISM IN DECLINE

As for Socialism, it is pointed out as a surprising fact, affording evidence of the extent to which our civilization has already decayed, that, although the Capitalist system is clearly breaking down from its own inherent defects, although in fact Socialism is becoming with ever-increasing clearness the only permanent solution of the world's economic troubles, Socialists have been completely unable to take advantage of their opportunity. Instead of growing in power and confidence, they have never been less influential since the time of the publication of the Communist Manifesto. The collapse of Capitalism, instead of bringing the expropriation of the capitalist and the dictatorship of the proletariat, is shattering Socialist movements, enslaving proletariats, and establishing a series of Fascist dictatorships.

As the economic situation grows worse, the rôle of evolutionary Socialism becomes not that of the destroyer but of the apologist of Capitalism. In Germany the Social Democrats, pursuing the policy of "the lesser evil," consented to every kind of compromise, sought ever more humiliating alliances with capitalist parties in fear of the growing power of Hitlerism. When the time was ripe, the allies whose support they had purchased by ignominious concessions abandoned them, and Hitler smashed their organization out of existence in a few weeks. In England the constitutional Labour Party is increasingly used as a cat's-paw by the Capitalists, its function being to persuade workers to accept wage-cuts in the present, while it dopes them with promises for the future. Incapable of rising to the opportunity presented by Capitalism tottering to collapse, it strains

every effort to keep Capitalism on its feet. Thus, as Capitalism declines, Socialism declines with it, and Labour leaders come out in their true colours as the camp-followers of the retreating army of their professed opponents. These strictures are used as a basis for the conclusions that we shall never get Socialism by parliamentary methods, and that we had better therefore prepare ourselves to obtain it by other methods. "Other methods," of course, mean, although the avowal is rarely made, underground organization, discipline and drilling in preparation for an inevitable armed struggle. So much for Socialism. . . . The indictment is formidable rather than convincing.

DEMOCRACY, A FAILURE OR A SUCCESS?

Take first the strictures on democracy. It might, I think, be plausibly maintained that recent events are testimonies not to the failure of democracy but to its success. For more than half a century democracy has been busy establishing political equality without making any substantial advances in the direction of economic equality. But it was inevitable sooner or later, as Laski has pointed out in his *Democracy in Crisis*,¹ that the political power which democracy had conferred upon the masses should be used to obtain economic concessions. So long as Capitalism prospered, concessions could be made and the working classes subsisted fairly comfortably on the crumbs, the increasingly plentiful and succulent crumbs—old age pensions, health and unemployment insurance, training centres, minimum wages—which fell from the Capitalist's table; for Capitalism in those days was fat.

¹ London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd.

To-day there is, alas, no more fat to cut away; Capitalism, in fact, is cut to the bone. The workers cannot, therefore, utilize the instrument of democracy to obtain further concessions without seriously menacing the economic position of the Capitalist classes. The Capitalists have, accordingly, embarked upon a campaign to smash the political instrument by means of which alone the transfer of economic power can be made; that is, against the democracy which is the only system that permits the numerical strength of the masses, exercised through the ballot-box, to pull its full weight in the conduct of affairs. Hence the contemporary unpopularity of democracy, the familiar argument that it cannot cope with the accumulating difficulties of the times; that its methods are cumbrous and out of date; that, when action is imperative, it sterilizes men of action and puts a premium on men of talk. Hence, too, in countries where the economic situation is more desperate than in England the rise of Fascist dictatorships, which perform the double function of a Capitalist shield against the further advances of the workers, and a Capitalist spearhead against the political organization which has enabled advances to be made in the past. Fascism is, in fact, Capitalism's last ditch.

But, if it is, it is democracy which is driving it there. For the question inevitably presents itself: Why should this diagnosis, if it be accepted, be construed as a failure of democracy? Surely it is because democracy has been succeeding all too well in its task of transforming the grossly inequitable society which has been jerry-built on the foundations of the Industrial Revolution into a permanent structure based on equality, because it

proposes to extend an ampler, richer life not to a privileged class, but to its citizens as a whole, because, in fact, it is an instrument for the introduction of Socialism, that it is made the target of criticism from those who have most to lose from the employment of the instrument. But the fact that democracy has engaged in ironing out some of the inequalities of society in the past, and is ready to hand as an instrument for the further transformation of society in the future, while it affords ample ground for criticism and dislike on the part of the privileged classes, affords none at all for progressives who still care for the traditional liberal goods of freedom of thought and speech, and who believe that the will of the majority is the best safeguard for the continued enjoyment of these goods, or for Socialists who demand the substitution of a society based on collective ownership for a competitive system based on private property, to join in the chorus of critics. Once they see that democracy is in disgrace *precisely because it is succeeding*, they will, I hope, change their tactics and, instead of joining those who have all to gain by its overthrow, rally to its support.

WHY IS SOCIALISM IMPOSSIBLE?

And is it after all so clear that the machinery of a democratic Parliament is incapable of gradually transforming society in the direction of Socialism by economic planning on the lines indicated in the first section of the F.P.S.I. Basis? The Socialist movement is engaged at the time of writing in a controversy of equal bitterness and sterility as to the respective merits of constitutionalism and dictatorship considered as instruments for the

introduction of Socialism. Sir Stafford Cripps and others advocate an electoral programme which places revision of the House of Commons procedure and abolition of the House of Lords in the forefront as prerequisites of the passage of Socialist legislation. A Socialist majority having been obtained, the procedure of Parliament would be revised and the fundamentals of a Socialist programme passed by the method of Orders in Council. The advantages of such a course are obvious. Under the present parliamentary procedure the legislation necessary to effect the changes involved in the transformation of society to a Socialist basis would take a lifetime.

On the other side it is urged, first, that the course proposed is tantamount to a dictatorship of the left. Democracy would be asked for a mandate for its own supersession and, once the mandate was obtained, would, in fact, be superseded. The dangers of a dictatorship are notorious, and are not any the less formidable because the dictatorship contemplated is one of the left in the interests of Socialism, and not a dictatorship of the right in the interests of reaction. Secondly, it is said, the course proposed is impracticable for the simple reason that there would be no dictatorship of the left. The reactionary elements in the country would not permit its establishment. Any attempt to supersede the traditional forms of Parliament would be used as a pretext for unconstitutional action to resist the change, to which the Army, the police, and perhaps the Civil Service would be only too ready to subscribe in ostensible support of Crown and Constitution.

There are two observations which I should like to offer upon this controversy. First, it is difficult to avoid

the reflection that it affords an eminent example of those abstract and sterile disputes to which persons holding advanced political and social views are so lamentably prone. Advanced thinkers—and it would be idle to pretend that members of the F.P.S.I. are exempt from this stricture—are at all times ready to waste their energies in abstract discussions of theoretical contingencies which will in all probability never arise. Trained and versed in such discussions from the days of their intellectual puberty, they have achieved a certain ingenious skill in their conduct. Inevitably we tend to indulge in activities which habit has rendered familiar, and in which training and tradition have conferred competence; inevitably we prefer them to the detailed work of constructive planning.

THE NEED FOR A PLAN

Now this particular controversy seems to me to play straight into the hands of the other side. So long as Socialists continue to quarrel about the Second and Third Internationals, about Fascism and social democracy, about dictatorship and democracy, about revolution and revisionism, they will remain an easy prey to whatever reactionary from the right has the intelligence and the resolution to call their bluff. The task of Socialists is to show that they can form here and now a Socialist Government which will not merely take power, but, when it has got it, produce and apply an economic plan to repair the ravages of Capitalism. If Socialists can not only do that, but convince the people that they can, they will sweep the country, and, backed by the support of the mass of the people, they can feel reasonably assured

that no movement from the right, whether it relied on the veto of the House of Lords or took the form of an unconstitutional bid for power, could avail to stop them.

The conclusion is that Socialists should base their propaganda upon the provisions of a detailed and carefully worked-out economic plan, not upon slogans about democracy and dictatorship, which, instead of recruiting new supporters, serve only to divide the old. To sidetrack the main issue with discussions of constitutional questions and speculations upon the kind of resistance which a Socialist Government might expect to encounter is to play the game on the enemies' home ground. For this reason the F.P.S.I. puts constructive economic planning in the forefront of its Manifesto, instead of taking sides upon the sterile issues of abstract Socialist controversy.

Having said so much, I cannot refrain from adding a few words in pursuance of the controversy I have denounced. I will suppose that a Socialist Government has been elected to power, that it has a plan for the economic reconstruction of society, and that it proceeds to put it into practice. Is it really so certain that it would be met by unconstitutional opposition backed by force from the right? The answer admittedly is obscure, but one thing at least is fairly clear. None of the constitutional examples which are quoted in support of this view have any but the remotest bearing upon the issue. Neither in Italy nor in Germany was a Socialist party in power at the time of the counter-revolution. Neither in Italy nor in Germany was a Socialist party by virtue of its power in control of the Army, the police, or the financial system. On the contrary, all these keys to the

situation were in the hands of the other side. Are we, then, entitled to assume that in England a duly elected Socialist Government returned by a majority in the constituencies with a mandate to effect radical economic changes, in control of the Civil Service, the Army, the Navy, and the police, would be necessarily bound to succumb to unconstitutional resistance from the right, merely because Socialists, without power, without control, without the authority of a duly accredited Government, and lacking a majority in the country, failed in Germany and Italy? The assumption seems to me to be baseless; yet the whole case for the impossibility of introducing Socialism by parliamentary methods in this country can be shown to rest upon it.

WAR IN EUROPE BETWEEN WHOM?

The war situation demands an essay to itself. I have space here only for the briefest treatment. First, that the world is full of rumours of wars which multiply instead of diminishing as the months pass is true. It is true also that the probable failure of the Disarmament Conference to reach any substantial convention will precipitate a new race of armaments; true, too, that the present rulers of Germany are apparently determined on a war of revenge, as soon as they have accumulated enough armaments to give them a chance of success. In spite of these things I do not myself believe that, so far as Europe is concerned, a war is likely in the near future, and this for two main reasons. First, it is extremely difficult to determine between which nations the war would take place. Germany is the obvious danger centre; yet Germany, still partly disarmed herself, is surrounded

by a ring of vigilant Powers whom the brutal intransigence of her rulers has alarmed and antagonized in equal degrees. Germany cannot challenge this ring of potential enemies without well-equipped allies. Where are they to be found? With France and Poland, her immediate neighbours, an alliance is unthinkable. Soviet Russia, the object of the most violent Nazi attacks, has been driven in the direction of a rapprochement with France and Poland. The Little Entente is hostile and pro-French. Only Italy and Austria remain. Will Mussolini join hands with Hitler in the hope of establishing a Fascist domination of Central Europe? Nobody can answer this question with any degree of confidence—least of all a writer whose ignorance of foreign politics is surpassed only by his repulsion for its methods. I must content myself, then, with citing the opinions of the experts to the effect that such a development is most improbable, and adding that at the time of writing all the indications are against it. As for Austria, it is doubtful whether, even if Germany were to absorb Austria, the resulting combination would be strong enough to challenge the heavily armed power of France. One of the few good things that can be said of Nazi Germany is that the common horror and the common alarm which it has excited among civilized peoples have produced a measure of unity on the Continent which, whatever one may think of the sentiments from which it takes its rise, is on the whole a factor making for the peace of the world. Thus, so far, at least, as the next five, possibly the next ten, years are concerned, the indications point to a continuance of the present strained but quiescent vigilance, with the Powers remaining in the posture of wrestlers

warily watching for an opening that never comes to catch one another at a disadvantage.

Secondly, can Hitler afford to arm the German people? It may well be doubted. Of those twelve million who, in spite of threats and intimidation, in spite of the imprisonment of their leaders, the suppression of their Press, and the banning of their meetings, voted Communist or Social Democrat at the March 1933 election, it is unthinkable that *all* should have become Nazi in sentiment, whatever they may be in profession. On the contrary, there is reason to suppose that there persists an opposition to the Nazi régime which is none the less intense because it is driven underground, and that hundreds of thousands of men who have seen their friends and leaders imprisoned, beaten, tortured, and murdered, are imbued with such a burning sense of injustice and wrong, such a passionate loathing of the terror which oppresses them, such a longing for revenge, that to arm the German people for international war is to set the stage for civil war. Hitler cannot, one supposes, be blind to these things. Until, then, the tale of outrages has ceased, and the memory of the terror has in part faded, it seems doubtful whether the German people as a whole can be effectively armed for war.

IV. The Challenge to Reason

FREE WILL, AND THE REASONABLENESS OF MAN

In the preceding section I have tried to show first, that the collapse of the economic system is not a *foregone* conclusion; secondly, that democracy need not *necessarily* be written off as a failure; thirdly, that the gradual

introduction of a Socialist régime by parliamentary methods would not *inevitably* be followed by unconstitutional resistance leading to a right dictatorship; and fourthly, that war in the immediate future is not only *not certain* but is *unlikely*. I am not claiming that I have proved any of these propositions; I have merely given some reasons for refusing to share the dogmatic pessimism which is professed by so many contemporary thinkers of the left. As a believer in free will, I find it impossible to subscribe to what may be termed the "inevitability dogma." There are, I think, no certainties in human affairs, and, where so much is uncertain, there is at least a reasonable chance that our civilization may turn its present corner without war, economic collapse, or, so far at least as this country is concerned, oppressive dictatorship.

It is of this chance that a body such as the F.P.S.I. has been formed to take advantage. Believing in the ultimate rationality of our species, it believes that the men and women of this generation may yet be influenced by reason to adopt the courses that make for their greatest happiness. It is, indeed, very hard to induce people to do what will be to their advantage and make them happy. But the attempt is always worth making, and does not always fail. That the realization of the aims for which the F.P.S.I. stands would sensibly increase human happiness, making men's lives brighter, their thoughts serener, their bodies healthier, by robbing them of the preventable evils from which they suffer to-day is, I believe, a proposition which is capable of demonstration. Believing, then, that human beings are fundamentally, and in spite of all the evidence to the

contrary, reasonable beings, we believe also that, if we only argue cogently enough, persuasively enough, and patiently enough in support of these aims, we can, in the long run, bring other people to share them. Our conviction of man's rationality means, in effect, that for us the belief that a proposition is true carries with it the further belief that you can ultimately convince others of its truth, provided that they possess the normal allowance of human intelligence.

A VICTORIAN TRUST IN REASON

In this reliance which it places on human reason the attitude of the F.P.S.I. is no doubt unfashionably old-fashioned. It is even Victorian. It is John Stuart Mill who tells us of his father, James Mill, that "so complete was my father's reliance on the influence of reason over the minds of mankind, whenever it is allowed to reach them, that he felt as if all would be gained if the whole population were taught to read, if all sorts of opinions were allowed to be addressed to them by word and in writing, and if by means of a suffrage they could nominate a legislature to give effect to the opinions they adopted." And it is John Stuart Mill who, speaking of himself and his friends, the young Utilitarians, tells us that what they "principally thought of was to alter other people's opinions; to make them believe according to evidence and know what was their real interest, which, when they knew, they would, we thought, by the instrument of opinion, enforce a regard to it upon one another." The standpoint of the F.P.S.I. in this matter is that of the Mills, and in the present book accordingly "all sorts of opinions are addressed" to men's minds in writing,

just as in the numerous meetings which it organizes all sorts of opinions are addressed to men's minds in speech.

The F.P.S.I., in fact, makes an all-round appeal to the sanity of people. Going behind the programmes of the political parties, it defines a series of measures which, it believes, fulfil three conditions. First, they are such as will increase men's happiness. Secondly, that they will have this result is a truth capable of demonstration; it is not only that we believe that to adopt the F.P.S.I. proposals will make people happier; we believe also we can convince them that it will. Thirdly, they are such as are already supported by a substantial body of advanced opinion. This body of opinion has found expression in the great variety of the speakers who have consented to appear upon the F.P.S.I. platform. Celebrities who have never hitherto been detected in association, or who have associated only on a basis of watchful and suspicious vigilance, have addressed common audiences from a common F.P.S.I. platform with no overt indication of being any the worse for the experience. The Sex and Peace Groups of the Federation have been particularly successful in providing a common meeting-place for the left and right wing sections of the movements whose effectiveness they are formed to promote.

THE AGREEMENT TO AGREE

This result can only be achieved by concentrating upon points of agreement and avoiding those of difference. To discover and discuss the things that divide people is at once more stimulating and amusing than to emphasize those which unite them. But, as the history of left-wing movements in this country shows, no form of

intellectual self-indulgence is more fatal to effectiveness. The policy of the F.P.S.I. is, therefore, to seek to enlist members for propaganda only in respect of those ends which they hold in common, and to insist that they shall ignore the ends in respect of which they differ.

It is not Communist, but it will gladly work with Communists, if they will accept its assistance in the fight against war. It is not Liberal, but it will gladly work with Liberals, in defence of democracy and of freedom of writing and speech. It deplores the influence of the Established Church upon men's minds, seeks to weaken its hold upon their education, believes that its thought is reactionary, and that for a Christian body its war record is contemptible; but it would strongly oppose any proposals for denying its members opportunity to organize the worship of God in their own way, and to induce as many as they can to worship with them. What in fact we have sought to do is to become a mutual aid organization for progressives. As such, we are concerned less to put forward a policy of our own than to increase the propagandist effectiveness of other bodies in pursuit of the aims which we share with them. We would, if we could, unite these bodies into a single, cohesive force. If we cannot do this, we can at least endeavour to bring them together for common action on specific issues. Our job, in a word, is to become one of those "efficiency organizations" to effect world change, of which Wells speaks in his introduction to this book.

WORLD GOVERNMENT AND THE WORLD CITIZEN

The distinguishing as it is also the most deeply held faith of the Federation is in world government. H. G.

Wells, who is chiefly responsible for the draft of the early sections of its Basis, has taught its members to believe that there can be no settled peace in the world, no steady progress to an ordered society, no realization of the promise of science to provide an ampler, richer life for mankind, until the competing national sovereignties which divide and distract the modern world are superseded by a collective world government. Such a government would take initially the form of an international consultative control, which would at first supplement, and later supersede the functions of the various national governments. It would put the production of armaments and of the main economic necessities beyond the reach of profit-seeking manipulation, and would make the protection of workers from exploitation and under-payment a matter of collective concern.

Nor, in spite of the evidence to the contrary, do I believe this objective to be as chimerical as is generally supposed. There is, I believe, beginning to be born for the first time in man's history the outlook of the citizen of the world State, not merely in the minds of Utopiasts and philosophers dreaming in their studies, but in ordinary men and women, as they go about their daily concerns. There is in England, in France, in Russia, in America, a growing number who are transcending in thought the whole conception of egoistic nationalism. They see that the apparatus of nationalism, with its world full of boastful little patriotic States, all complete in themselves, all cut to pattern, each with its silly Foreign Office, its tawdry national honour, its private army imitating all the other armies, its protected industries all exactly alike, its history books, each with its special

national lie about history, its special group of financiers rigging its exchanges, its tariffs for keeping foreigners out, its Larousse dictionaries claiming every discovery for its own nationals, its special collection of great men, its wonderful flag with its bars this way or that, or cross-wise for variety, its marvellous peasant costumes and folk-lore exactly like all the other peasant costumes and folk-lore, its group of young men anxious to kill other young men in defence of its honour, is a hopeless anachronism which has become a public danger.

Their conviction is also that of the F.P.S.I. The common thread that runs through all its varied proposals is its belief in the possibility of their world-wide application. Hence, while in the pages which follow there is a detailed treatment of each of the sections of its Basis, there is no specific contribution on internationalism as such. Internationalism must, in fact, be taken as a presupposition to the whole. As such, it is introduced in H. G. Wells's foreword, with its insistence on *world* reconstruction as a condition of a *world* Pax, as the common aim of all progressives; as such, it is stressed at the close of this general exposition by the first president of the F.P.S.I. of its policy and programme. He trusts that the reader will accept it for his mental background as he studies the various proposals which follow, since it is in a very real sense the actual background of their realization.

CHAPTER II

THE ECONOMICS OF PLANNING

by
ALLAN YOUNG

1. "*Regional and World Planning* with a view to
 - (a) The progressive replacement of production for profit by production for use as rapidly as competent collective direction can be organized.
 - (b) The scientific development of the actual and potential resources of the world.
 - (c) The distribution of the resulting wealth to provide the fullest and most vigorous life possible for the whole species.
 - (d) The setting up of world economic research and statistical centres to elaborate and direct a world plan."
2. "*The Reorganization of Finance*, including
 - (a) The establishment of a world banking organization and a world currency.
 - (b) The alleviation of creditor burdens involving the cancellation of war debts.
 - (c) The ultimate establishment of central control of the distribution of raw materials in order to stabilize world prices."

The Basis of the Federation of Progressive Societies and Individuals.

CHAPTER II

THE ECONOMICS OF PLANNING

THE purpose of this brief summary is to advance a view of the present economic situation, and to discover if possible what are the tests which any policy must satisfy if we are to regard it as adequate for a solution of the problems now confronting us.

We shall try to avoid the narrow limits of Party controversy, and applaud or condemn Party programmes only by implication, as they meet, or fail to meet, what seems, as a result of objective study, to be the requirements of the economic situation.

It is true that this might only be a partial test of political policies, for man is an individual with cultural tastes and desires, as well as being a social animal dependent upon collective organization for his comfort. We must keep clearly in mind, therefore, that our desire is not that Britain should merely be run efficiently, like a factory, but that it should be governed intelligently for the enrichment of life and the enlargement of liberty. An orderly and satisfactory economic system should strive to release men, not to enslave them.

WHAT IS ECONOMICS?

Economics is the study of the mechanism which regulates and directs the production and distribution of goods and services in response to human demands. The efficiency of an economy might reasonably be judged, therefore, by the degree to which these functions are satisfactorily

performed. Account must be taken, of course, of the natural resources available for exploitation, the stage of scientific and technical progress, and the quantity and quality of the labour force.

Judged by that test in this age of technical development it is clear that there is something wrong with the world at the present time. Sordid, squalid poverty is housed in revolting slums in every city. Under-nourished children grow into ugly and diseased adults in the unlovely surroundings of our industrial towns. Land, capital equipment, and labour, which might supply the wants of a needy population, stand idle and immobilized. Meantime coffee is burnt in Brazil, wheat is rotting in Canada, cotton is ploughed into the soil in America, and fish thrown back into the sea in Britain. There is no process of reasoning by which this situation can be justified. It is only by a study of economics that it can be explained.

DISEQUILIBRIUM

Normally, in a profit-making society the power to buy goods can only be distributed in the process of producing them. There are modifications of this in the payments of state pensions, unemployment benefits, etc., but the principal stream of purchasing power is distributed as wages, salaries, profits, dividends, and rents, in return for service in production. It is clear, therefore, that as men are only able to buy goods as a result of producing and selling other goods, the maintenance of equilibrium in the physical volume of the different commodities produced is highly important. If the production of coffee in Brazil, wheat in Canada, cotton in America, etc., exceeds the production of motor cars, wireless sets,

boots, and railway journeys elsewhere, then the *price* of coffee, wheat, and cotton, in terms of the other commodities, falls, and the price of motor cars and wireless sets (in terms of coffee, wheat, and cotton) rises. If the increased production of wheat, etc., is so great as to cause prices to fall below the cost of its production, then certain consequences result. The fall in the incomes of wheat and coffee growers reduces their power to buy motor cars, etc., and workers engaged in these industries lose their employment. If this disequilibrium is great enough, then we get hungry children in Britain and rotting food in Canada; ill-clad people in Europe, while cotton is destroyed in the United States.

This is, in fact, an over-simplification of the case. Other factors have contributed towards the particular instances discussed. The argument has been used merely as a rough indication of what occurs when certain equations in the economic system are upset.

FACTORS IN DISEQUILIBRIUM

There are many factors that may contribute singularly or collectively to the disturbance of equilibrium: (a) All the producers of a particular article may miscalculate demand and overstock the market. (b) Individual producers may each miscalculate the quantities that other producers will supply. (c) Some new product may be placed on the market that will act as a substitute for, and displace, another product. (The substitution of rubber for leather, oil for coal, and artificial silk for cotton.) (d) Financial policy may alter the money prices at which goods passing between different countries would exchange.

The disequilibrium in quantities and in prices that

would arise from all or any of these causes might lead to depression in certain industries, the unemployment of workers engaged in those industries, and a consequent fall in their purchasing power that would reduce the market for the products of other industries and so spread the dislocation throughout the system.

Another important factor causing disequilibrium is the failure of the rate of investment to equal the rate of saving. The *price* of goods and services is made up by the distribution of incomes as *costs* in the production of the goods and services. It follows, therefore, that unless all these incomes are *spent*, the goods and services produced cannot all be sold. Hoarding will upset the balance between production and demand. Savings deposited in the banks will upset it unless they can be forced back into effective demand through investment. And this equation is more difficult to maintain than may appear on the surface. Not only must total incomes enter into effective demand, but the production of different *kinds* of goods must harmonize with different *kinds* of demand. The production of capital goods (i.e. factories, railways, equipment, etc.) must be related to the volume of savings for investment. The production of consumption goods must be related to the demand for consumption goods. If savings are held idle and immobilized, supply outstrips demand and equilibrium is endangered or disturbed.

POST-WAR HYSTERIA

These dangers have always been present in Capitalist society, and it may be asked whether there is anything exceptional or peculiar in the present situation. Is it merely an ordinary trade slump, from which we shall

eventually emerge as a result of the ordinary process of adjustment?

Certainly there have been exceptional factors since the war, that have thrown an extraordinary strain upon the economic system. The huge indebtedness incurred by belligerent nations in the war, and the reparations imposed upon the defeated Powers by the peace treaties, intensified the struggle for foreign markets. The debtor nations were struggling to obtain a foreign trade surplus out of which to meet their foreign obligations. The creditor nations were seeking markets which would keep their factories busy and their workers employed. Every student of affairs is now familiar with the dilemma produced by these circumstances. The debtor nations could only pay their debts by the export of goods or the export of gold. The creditor nations could not receive payment in goods without throwing their own workers out of employment. Markets were disorganized in an orgy of weak selling and subsidized selling. Prices fell steadily. The wages of workers in each country were reduced in efforts to compete at the lower price levels. The fall in wages throughout the world reduced the purchasing power of markets as rapidly as costs and prices fell.

With every fall in the money value of goods there was a corresponding increase in the real burden of money debts—that is to say, the value of the debts, expressed in terms of goods, was increased with every fall in prices. The bond-holder became richer; the producer became poorer. This ruinous competition failed to effect its purpose. Debtor nations were still unable to obtain for their exports sufficient money to meet their payments as they fell due; gold was shipped to the creditor nation;

the exchange rates of currencies were disorganized; country after country was forced off the gold standard, and finally forced to default on its foreign payments.

It would be ridiculous to deny that these exceptional burdens have contributed to the exceptional intensity and duration of the depression, which reached a point of crisis in this country in 1931. But it is also true that there are other features of the depression that must not be ignored, if we are to appreciate correctly what policy we ought to pursue to restore equilibrium and achieve prosperity.

THE DECLINE OF THE MARKET

Although it is true that the artificial burden of war debts and reparations imposed a great strain on the productive system, it is also true that there has been a tremendous increase in the productivity of labour as a result of scientific invention and technical improvement. If markets had expanded sufficiently to enable debts to be paid by the sale of goods and services, then these additional burdens might have been borne without great difficulty. But the markets did not expand sufficiently. The rapid industrial development of the world had turned former customer countries into competitors. The balance of production had been upset by the duplication of plant and equipment throughout the world.

Capitalist society has never been and, by its nature, could never have been a static form of social and economic organization. It lives by expansion. The surplus it exists to create for the owners of capital must be crystallized into new capital holdings in new or extended forms of production. The abnormal conditions of the last hundred

years were peculiarly suited to free or *laissez-faire* Capitalism. New areas were being opened up; primitive communities were being brought within the market; skilled methods of production enabled populations to increase; the spread of industrialism provided an outlet for the ever-increasing products (and surpluses) both in the form of consumable goods and in new capital equipment.

These conditions no longer exist. The ability to produce surpluses (i.e. profits for investment) is now much greater than the profitable opportunities to invest them. The struggle for markets has thus been intensified and the comfortable era of easy natural expansion is ended.

It is often suggested by those who seek to minimize the crisis that, had the normal rate of emigration continued in the post-war years, a large part of our unemployment problem would not have existed. They fail to see that the cessation of emigration, far from being an indication of the transitory nature of the problem, is a symptom that reveals the permanent and deep-seated character of the changes to which the economic system must be adjusted. Emigration belongs to the period of outward expansion. Its cessation is the evidence that effective expansion¹ is not taking place.

¹ This is really only another facet of the Saving-Investment disequilibrium. During the development of new territories or resources the demand for both capital and consumption goods (paid for out of investment) increases without adding—or, while adding very little—to the supply of those goods. The surplus which other workers are creating is therefore consumed by workers thus diverted from production for immediate demand. The fact that the market for some goods is expanding (i.e. wireless, oil, motor cars) is no refutation of what I am trying briefly to convey, for this expansion is cancelled out by a contracting demand for other goods.

THE GROWTH OF RESTRICTIONS

The period of rapid expansion was accompanied by the growth of mass production. The larger the market became, so did the size of the efficient unit of production increase. There has thus been a progressive increase in the amount of fixed capital (i.e. factories, machinery, etc.) required for competitive production, and, so far has this process gone, that private enterprise, in the strict sense of the term, has been largely eliminated.

This large-scale production has created also a greater rigidity in the industrial system. Fixed capital cannot readily be diverted to other forms of production than those for which it is originally intended. Adjustments are more difficult. Machines cannot be turned out into the street like workers when trade is bad. They must be kept running in order to earn the cost of their upkeep and depreciation. This rigidity of the productive system, which is also contributed to by the greater ability of the worker to resist wage reductions, intensifies the difficulties of Capitalism in a period of market restriction or relative decline.

It is in response to these market conditions that various efforts have been made to establish some measure of conscious control over production and trade. Tariffs and quotas have been employed in the hope of preserving for each country its home markets for its own products. Debtor countries have adopted exchange restrictions or export subsidies as a means of safeguarding their currencies or acquiring sufficient foreign currency to meet the service of their foreign debts. Foreign lending has been curtailed because of the decline of profitable

opportunities for investment. Various other methods of restriction and control have been attempted in recent years. For example, there are the producers' restriction schemes under which the quantity of goods released for sale is regulated; national and international cartels that endeavour to fix prices and limit supplies by agreement; and selling organizations, as for instance in the British steel trade, that strive to eliminate competition between rival firms of the same country in their sales to foreign markets.

Private efforts of this kind which rely for their success on the producers themselves have usually broken down. In some cases failure has resulted merely from the breaking of the agreement, under whatever pretext, by individual producers. In other cases the apparent success of the schemes has brought their own destruction. If prices began as a result to recover, new producers were attracted by the prospect of profit, and their competitive and unrestricted production recreated the conditions which the schemes were designed to abolish. It has been found, of course, that national schemes have been more easy to maintain than international schemes. A closer watch can be kept on the behaviour of individual firms and the opportunities of frequent consultation are greater. It is also easier to apply restriction to minerals than to vegetable products. You can only produce tin from a tin mine, and there is a strict limit to the number of places where tin deposits can be found. On the other hand wheat can be grown in a wide and expandable area.

Because of the difficulties that were encountered, it has been found necessary to recruit the help of Govern-

ments to formulate and enforce these schemes. In the international field the regulation, with Governmental assistance, of the output of certain primary products, such as tin, wheat, sugar, and rubber, is now in operation.

Similar developments of Governmental intervention have been taking place in domestic production. In Britain we have examples, such as the Agricultural Marketing Act and the Coal Mines Reorganization Commission, under which producers' schemes are enforced by statutory authority. This extension of Governmental function in the economic life of the nation has been enormously enlarged in recent years. The movement towards some form of collectivist organization has been speeded up, partly by the crisis itself but more particularly as a result of the Protectionist policy which the crisis forced us to adopt.

THE PREFACE TO PLANNING

The abandonment of Free Trade has a much greater significance, therefore, than the mere levying of duties upon imports. It is a most important step in the abandonment of certain principles that govern a self-regulating economic system. To interfere with the price system by unequal and varied taxes on imports, restriction of output, pegging of prices, subsidies, etc., places the individual on whose decisions and reactions the operation of the system depends in a similar position to that of a doctor who cannot rely upon his thermometer to register the temperature of his patient.

In economic *theory* a free market, *laissez-faire*, profit-making society can be shown to be perfect—if people would only watch the indicators and obey the rules. Such

a society is governed by the price system. Given the necessary time, the price system will re-establish equilibrium when it is disturbed. It will cause the production of commodities over-produced to be reduced to harmonize with market demand; it will cause redundant plant to be eliminated by driving out the weakest producers through intensified competition; it will guide capital into the expansion of those industries where expansion is necessary to balance the production of commodities entering into exchange; it will vary the interest rates on money, and by so doing regulate savings in accordance with the opportunity for investment; and it will adjust the distribution of capital and labour to the requisite employment to produce the goods consumers want to buy. In the doing of all these things it may put thousands of entrepreneurs in the bankruptcy courts, cause great masses of wage-earners to lose their employment for considerable periods, reduce the wages of millions of workers to below the poverty line, and generally spread ruin, misery, and death in its trail. But it will work. And that is a great and comforting reflection to an academic economist.

This system, however, no longer exists, if, indeed, it ever did. It has already been partially abolished, not by Socialists, but by Capitalists themselves, under the pressure of necessity, or the prospect of greater profits. But no adequate alternative system has yet been constructed to take its place. The present situation cannot continue. We cannot live with one foot in a free economy and the other in a planned economy. We have embarked upon the era of regulation and planning. Retreat is impossible. We cannot retrace our steps in economic and

social evolution, however much we might wish to do so, nor can we halt the process of inevitable change.

A PLANNED ECONOMY

So far we have been dealing only with the economic mechanism of society and ignoring all considerations of social justice. This has been done deliberately in order to show that on grounds of efficiency alone the existing structure has proved to be inadequate. On grounds of social justice the system hardly needed to be examined in order to be condemned.

But the attitude of impartial objective study cannot be maintained when we begin to consider the form of economic organization which should take its place. We have seen that the self-regulating economy of *laissez-faire* Capitalism has already been half-abolished. At the moment the system is in process of transition, and desirability must enter into our decision as to what kind of economy should now be created. What kind of economy should it be? The answer of the F.P.S.I. is that it must above all things be a planned economy. But when we use the phrase "a planned economy" we must answer the question, Planning for what?

Most people will probably supply their own answer at once in terms of their own political idealism. Here we must answer the question in terms that bear the closest possible relation to economics. The ideal economic condition is that in which every factor of production is most effectively employed to give the maximum human satisfaction in the supply of goods and services with the minimum demand upon the leisure of the people. The object of planning should be to achieve and maintain

this ideal condition by the progressive elimination of all the factors that militate against it. It is in that sense that the phrase "a planned economy" is here being used.

NATIONAL AND WORLD PLANNING

The next question is whether we are thinking in terms of a planned world economy or a planned national economy. The answer is, both. It will not be within the power of the public to which this book is addressed alone to determine the speed at which order and arrangement can be introduced into *world* economic affairs. It *is* within their power, however, to see to it that the form of planning adopted in Britain will encourage rather than retard world agreement, and that our national system should be so constructed as to harmonize with an international system in which the chaos of competitive production will give place to ordered economic co-operation between the peoples of the world.

The principal point at which our national economy impinges on the world is our foreign trade. The chaotic conditions that now prevail in world markets make it imperative that some better system of organizing our trade relationship with other countries should be devised as an essential preliminary to internal planning. It is a happy circumstance, therefore, that the form of organization that seems to be necessary in the interests of internal planning is also the most helpful to a policy of international or world co-operation.

A planned national economy in an unplanned world would have to be a protected economy. If we are to maintain a high standard of living, and pursue a monetary policy which shall have as its guiding object the employ-

ment of our people and not the stability of foreign exchange rates, then a situation might arise in which our internal price level would be higher than that of other countries. This could not continue unless some buffer organization was created which would correct the consequences of any disparity in the costs of production which might exist as between the planned unit and the unplanned world. In the absence of some protective buffer organization a series of economic reactions would be set up which would bring prices, and therefore wages, back to the level of competitive equality with other nations.

If the balance between production and consumption is to be maintained, then the remuneration of the producers must be protected from the consequences of market fluctuations due to an unregulated flow of foreign goods at prices which might be below our own costs of production. Similarly, in order to pay for our imports, our exports may have to be sold in the world markets at prices below the costs of production in a planned economy which is striving to maintain a high standard of life. If the remuneration of workers engaged in the industries affected either by cheap imports or cheap exports were to be determined by the level of competitive world prices, then the whole purpose of planning would be frustrated.

It is clear, therefore, that an import and export organization on lines similar to that of Russia is needed. This organization would balance its cheap purchases against its cheap sales, and, out of the proceeds of its operations, pay economic prices to the export trades, while at the same time protecting the price level of home-produced goods by its purchase control over imports. The equilibrium of our internal economy would thus be preserved,

and we would also be enabled to enter into arrangements with other countries for the exchange of goods and services of that character and volume which might be prescribed by any international plan for the regulation of trade.

At the World Economic Conference in 1933 these questions of production and trade were discussed by people who, except in the case of Russia, had no power to control the operations they were discussing. A planned economy with an external trade organization would not be in that position. As the marketing organization for our exports and the purchasing organization for our imports, it would be able to enter into agreements for world regulation that would enable the potential resources of the world to be developed on planned lines, and the efforts of each nation to be diverted to the production of those commodities it is best fitted to produce. In short we would try to achieve by planning that rational division of labour in the world which was the underlying wisdom of free trade theory.

MONEY AND PRICES

The next essential in economic planning is that money should be neutralized as a factor contributing towards boom or slump. Monetary policy must be guided by the sole consideration of supplying a convenient medium of exchange and maintaining a stable, general price level within which particular prices would fluctuate in response to market conditions. The manipulation of money to make financiers' profits out of industrialists' losses must be prevented by a social control which subordinates finance to the needs of productive industry.

Here, again, we should seek the co-operation of other

countries through an international bank for the maintenance of stable exchange rates and the adjustment of the balance of payments between countries in such a way as to avoid currency competition. This policy would be in harmony with the efforts of the proposed foreign trade organization which would be seeking to balance the exchange of goods so as to prevent the credit disturbance that now arises from the monetary adjustment of trade disequilibrium. Such a policy would also be a first step towards a system of world monetary co-operation which might in its turn lead to the world currency which is advocated in the Basis of the F.P.S.I.¹

It will be seen that in the planned economy we are visualizing the existence of a price system is being assumed. There are idealists, of course, who desire to abolish not only Capitalism and any form of profit-making, but the price system and the wages system as well. We have no quarrel with these aspirations, but what is being discussed here is a planned society in which people of our own generation might hope to live. (We cannot always be thinking of our grandchildren—and in any case it is quite possible that they will disagree with our notions of what is an ideal organization of economic and social life.) Our idealism must, therefore, be tempered by some practical considerations. It is submitted that, until we have reached the stage of material abundance in which rationing of any kind is unnecessary, the best system of apportioning limited supplies and the best guide to the replenishing of the supply of different commodities is the price system.

In our examination of existing conditions we saw the

¹ See Basis, p. 63, I, 2 (a).

havoc that can be wrought through the medium of fluctuating prices. But it is not the price system which causes this dislocation; it is the failure or inability of competitive producers to respond to the market conditions which prices reveal. It is the productive system and not the price system that is at fault.

PRODUCTION

This brings us back to a consideration of the conditions our analysis revealed. So badly has the competitive system of production worked, that Capitalists themselves are striving to abolish it. Any partial success they may have achieved along the lines of effective integration and control is largely due to the help which, in one form or another, the Government, representing the nation as a whole, has been able to render. If it were true that an extension of this form of activity, industry by industry, would solve our problems, then the case for comprehensive planning would not be so strong.

But this is not true. The planning of Agricultural production and marketing certainly brings benefits to Agriculture—the distribution of these benefits as between the landlord, the farmer, and the workers is another matter. But it can only do so by detracting from the benefits of other sections of the community. It may be true that Agricultural prices are demonstrably too low, but to raise those prices without adding to the productivity and consuming power of the nation as a whole is merely to divert money from other commodities to food.

It would be an exaggeration to say that, in present world conditions, no net advantage would be secured to the nation by readjusting the balance between agri-

cultural and industrial production. There may be some advantage, but, compared with the size of the problem confronting us, it is infinitesimal. This is not to say that agriculture, steel, cotton, and coal production should not be planned. The object of these comments is to insist, however, that partial planning is not national planning, and that the equilibrium and expansion of production and demand can only be secured when the operations of each industry are made to conform to a comprehensive scheme in which the interest of all the citizens as *consumers* is considered paramount.

In such a scheme of national planning it is clear that the chaos of competitive production must be abolished. If each industry is to respond to the indication of prices and by so doing adjust its production in accordance with demand, then it is clear that the whole of its production must be co-ordinated on efficient lines under a single national authority. The question of ownership will be referred to later. At this stage it is only necessary to say that the control of the policy of each productive unit of this kind must be in the hands of a directorate which is seeking national welfare rather than greater profits. The artificial creation of scarcity in order to increase the incomes either of owners or of workers in one industry at the expense of the rest of the community would militate against the equilibrium which it is our purpose to create. (This remains true whether ownership is private or State ownership.) A reliable control would be a directorate that represented workers' interests, owners' interests, and consumers' interests. Such a directorate would be under the supervision of a Central Planning Authority directing the whole economic life of the nation. The day-

to-day management of industry would be entrusted to experts of the managerial class.

STATE PLANNING

With industries organized in this way, the production of goods would be regulated according to the movements of the price indicator, provided that other equations in the system were maintained. The dislocation which now arises from the failure of savings to flow back into effective demand in the form of investment (i.e. by the purchase of investment or capital goods) would have to be eliminated by a national Investment Board working under the direction of the State planning authority. The guiding principle in the direction of investment would be, as was stated earlier, the creation and maintenance of that equilibrium in which every factor of production was most effectively employed to give the maximum human satisfaction. New savings would be devoted to the fuller development and exploitation of our natural resources. It would be within our power consciously to determine what rate of saving was socially desirable, that is to say, the extent to which it was necessary to divert labour to the production of capital goods with a view to the greater production of consumption goods in the future.

Two methods could be employed. The remuneration of the lowest-paid workers would be progressively increased. Their increased demand for consumable goods would reduce the surpluses of industry to the level at which they could be usefully invested. The hours of labour would be reduced as it was found possible and desirable to reduce the volume of savings. In fact, it is

in the maintenance of this key equation that we would find a guide to the rate at which the standard of life could rise and the leisure and cultural opportunities of the people be increased. The significance of the point made earlier with regard to the end of the period of expansion will here be realized. While Capitalism could exploit its workers at home in order to pile up surpluses in the form of investment abroad the expansion of the home market was not essential. But with the slowing down of profitable opportunities for investment and the saturation and decline of markets abroad, the case for a rising standard of working-class life no longer rests upon humanitarian grounds alone, but upon obvious and imperative economic necessity.

OWNERSHIP

It has been said that this ideal economic condition would be achieved and maintained by the elimination of all the factors that militate against it. In so far as the private ownership of the means of production does so, then its progressive elimination would be essential. But it is not necessary because of this danger to convert the question of ownership into a vital matter of principle. From an economic standpoint it can only be one of expediency. The really vital point of principle is control, and so long as the direction and control of productive effort was brought into harmony with the national interest, and the national plan, the incomes paid to owners, as owners, would be relatively unimportant. Those who regard ownership as a matter of principle and public ownership as an essential preliminary to planning cannot expect to carry out their policy by

peaceful means over a wide area of production with any great rapidity. On the other hand, opinion has already moved a long way towards acceptance of the view that the nation has a right to acquire such control over economic policy as would make each branch of production conform to the interests of the community as a whole. Control can be acquired over the whole field of production more rapidly and more easily than ownership. And it is control not ownership which is essential to planning. If, in particular cases, public ownership could be shown to be essential to control, then action to secure it would be unanswerable, even by those who would oppose it as an abstract principle.

THE POLITICAL METHOD OF ACHIEVEMENT

This is only a brief outline of the case for planning, the problems involved in planning, and the methods which might be adopted to achieve the ideal equilibrium in which waste and poverty could be abolished. The technical economic problems require careful study. Easy, facile, political resolutions or slogans are of little value in this field of thought. It is only because the limited space into which this article has had to be compressed is so short that assertions have often been made where argument was called for. Nevertheless it has not been the intention of the writer to be dogmatic. Even a superficial knowledge of the subject is enough to teach one the qualifications and provisos that ought to be attached to almost any statement in the field of economic theory. But time and events are making decision more urgent. If what has been said will help towards the reaching of decisions among those who might not otherwise have

studied the subject from this angle, then the saying of it will have been worth while.

Although it is not the purpose of this article to discuss political method, it would be ridiculous to leave the subject as if one was unaware of the difficulties in the political field. The great political question of the day is not *whether* this control over the economic life of the nation should be acquired by the nation itself, but *how* it is to be acquired. The obstacle that stands in the way here is not the rigidity of the economic machine but the rigidity of men's minds. This ideological fixity arises largely from the intellectual reactions of men to their economic position in society. On the part of a section of the possessing class it is, perhaps, fear rather than greed. On the part of a section of the dispossessed it is passion arising from hunger and frustration.

In fact, the system of society which these possessors are defending has entered its period of inevitable decline, and they have really more to fear (if they only knew it) from resistance to change than from change itself. The dispossessed, on the other hand, are in danger of being led by eloquence, or driven by poverty, into an attitude of uncompromising defiance which will harden resistance to their demands. This is the familiar road of revolutionary preparation and leads not to a realization of the high idealism which Communism inspires or which Fascism labours to excite, but to Civil War with all the horror it involves. If to flinch from that be a weakness, then the whole of civilization and culture is a mistake.

The vast majority of the people of this country, however, have happily no desire or intention of dying for political formulas which may have little real significance in the

realm of economic fact. The politics of violence is still confined to small minorities to whom logic is more important than humanity, and the religious observance of theory more necessary than practical achievement in the circumstances and conditions of our time. There is a growing volume of informed and intelligent opinion which, under the revealing influence of recent events, has been moving towards an acceptance of some such policy as has here been outlined. The great Trade Union movement, which is the natural organization of working-class expression, is solidly on the side of social peace and constructive economic change. The Party structure in politics is at the moment concealing the unity of opinion that exists in favour of an intelligent series of demands. Surely an appeal to reason, which is based on such convincing proofs of necessity, ought to evoke a response from this opinion powerful enough to sweep away the opposition of prejudiced minds and recalcitrant interests. By a courageous use of the power which this support would confer, rapid progress could be made in the construction of a planned society in which "the progressive replacement of production for profit by production for use" could take place "as rapidly as competent collective direction can be organized."¹ In this transition phase we might at least achieve the abolition of that poverty and insecurity which has become both tragic and ridiculous when abundance could so easily be secured.

¹ F.P.S.I. Basis I, 1, (a).

CHAPTER III

THE PRICE OF PEACE

DISARMAMENT AND WORLD GOVERNMENT

by

W. ARNOLD-FORSTER

“The Setting up of a World Government necessarily involving

- (a) The disappearance of armaments and the complete suppression of the private manufacture of weapons, with the diversion to creative work of the energy thus released.
- (b) The progressive abrogation of national sovereignty as world authorities are brought into being.

Among first steps this involves progressive disarmament by example on the part of this country.”

The Basis of the Federation of Progressive Societies and Individuals.

CHAPTER III

THE PRICE OF PEACE—DISARMAMENT AND WORLD GOVERNMENT

THE WORLD TO-DAY

The nations, as I write, appear to be moving towards another great war. In Europe, Nazism and Fascism are triumphing, and freedom suffocates. In Germany hatred, revenge, and dreams of conquest are being exploited as means of welding the country into unity—the slavish unity of a “Totalitarian” State. In Asia, Japanese militarism is left victorious and unchallenged, despite the League’s formal condemnation; the plain obligations of League members to restrain the peace-breaker have been betrayed; and when the fateful year 1935 is reached, Japan will cease formally to be under any obligations towards the League. Japanese and American naval competition promises quickly to reach a fantastic scale of extravagance. American expenditure on naval construction is expected to be, for each of the next three years, treble the average for the past decade; and even the wide limits in naval building set by the London Naval Treaty of 1930 may not improbably be abandoned in the near future. Franco-Italian naval competition is still unlimited. Even now, during this unparalleled economic depression, the nations are spending admittedly and directly upon armaments a sum equal to about a thousand million gold pounds a year, despite their Covenants and Pacts and Disarmament Treaties; and, unless checked now, there will very soon

be an enormous increase in this unprecedented burden of expenditure for mutual massacre. The nations are like a lunatic family whose members starve themselves to fill their cellar with dynamite.

THE BETRAYAL WHICH ACCEPTS "INEVITABILITY"

Are we, then, to conclude that war is "inevitable," and await it as an ineluctable natural disaster, an "act of God," like earthquake? That would be the great betrayal. War is not even an unforeseeable explosion of human passion: it is a laboriously planned act of policy, far more deliberately and expensively prepared than any housing scheme or health service. If the nations, realizing the new opportunities of plenty created by modern industry and commerce, and realizing the new problem of survival created by modern science and communications, do really want to cut out the war system, they can do so. They can build a world commonwealth assured of peace and capable of justice. Yes, they can. That is the affirmation that we have to make now.

WORLD COMMONWEALTH IN THE LONG RUN INEVITABLE

Oh, it is possible certainly that the present attempt to found the world commonwealth will fail. It may be that within another decade another disaster, more shattering even than the Great War itself, will almost put out the lights of this civilization. But Caxton has seen to it that, even if—shall we say—the British Museum and the Louvre go up in smoke like the Library of Alexandria, many sparks of knowledge and culture will smoulder in the ashes. The problem of living as neigh-

bours on one planet, controlling our powers of self-destruction and using Nature's plenty, will remain, even if the attempt to solve it is interrupted; and presently, if not soon, the world commonwealth will be founded sufficiently securely to ensure that wars between the nations of to-day are ruled out as completely as wars between the members of the Heptarchy.

The problem will remain, and certain broad lines for its solution seem likely to remain constant. I will venture to draw up a catalogue of these main items, such as should be included in a moderate, short-range programme, omitting reference here to the necessary social and economic corollaries and conditions.

THE WILL FOR PEACE

First, there must of course be an informed and effective will for peace. The will must be strong enough to induce people to pay the price of doing without the war method; it must be informed by sufficient understanding of the means of getting rid of war; it must be sufficiently widely held to be effective; and it must have freedom for expression. At present we are only at the beginning of these tasks. All Governments and peoples want peace, in so far as they can get their own way without recourse to the war method; but they have only begun to realize or to accept the implications of getting rid of the war method for themselves and for others. The price of peace and justice includes renunciation of many claims to sovereign rights, many doctrines of national security, which are still commonly maintained by Government spokesmen everywhere.

EDUCATION IN WORLD LOYALTY

Something is being done in some quarters, especially in the United States, to provide the rudiments of education for world citizenship: but in general the teaching of history and economics is still so nationalistic in outlook that the fatal consequences of international anarchy in such a civilization as ours are never adequately realized; nor are the beginnings of world government made known or made exciting as they might be. And we still leave it to the soldiers to exploit for military ends the appeal of such splendid slogans as "National Service," the appeal of such bodies as the O.T.C. or the Balilla. Even the demand for physical education, to produce hardy and virile peoples, and the demand for the breaking down of class-barriers, is allowed to be twisted into an argument for general compulsory military service.

In giving life to the new world loyalty, it would be a help if in each country there were concrete evidences of the existence of the world community, such as would be afforded by the internationalization of civil air transport and the frequent international inspection of armaments.

WHAT OUR GOVERNMENT COULD DO

A Government in Great Britain which really cared about stimulating such loyalty could quickly make an enormous difference. It could embody the nation's peace-keeping obligations in a Peace Act of Parliament, so as to make them in effect part of the Constitution; it could negotiate the transfer to international authority of such control-stations as Gibraltar and Singapore;

it could stimulate extension of the Mandates principle and the principle of the Minorities Treaties. Even by a short-range policy, within four or five years, it could do enough on these lines to give new authority to the idea of world loyalty everywhere.

NEED FOR PUBLIC KNOWLEDGE AND CONTROL OF FOREIGN POLICY

But the first need now—even more important than any development of education for world citizenship—is the development and preservation of freedom of opinion and of the elements of public control over foreign policy. At the outset of this enterprise we run up against the brute facts of tyranny and the suppression of the freedom of the questing mind. Over a great part of Europe to-day the study of the case against the war-system is officially discouraged by persecution and the banning or burning of books. Not only refusal of military service on grounds of conscience, but also the mere presentation of the case for real renunciation of war, is cause for imprisonment. The public control of policy has been so utterly destroyed that the amounts expended on armaments cannot even approximately be ascertained. The contemporary despots, armed with the modern military machinery—armoured cars, machine guns, tear gas and the rest—are more impregnable in their authority than any of their predecessors. The masters of mechanical killing power, of the wireless and the Press, have now a new power, not far short of invincible, to silence or transform the will for peace and the idea of a supra-national loyalty.

ORGANS OF PEACE

The will for peace cannot grow strong enough or become effective without machinery, any more than steam can become effective unless it has an engine to work. A continuous organization, such as the League of Nations provides, with its code of peace, is indispensable. The absence of such an engine goes far to explain the ineffectual character of the peace movement before the war. Many of the arguments commonly used to-day as to the impossibility of preventing war are drawn from pre-war experience without taking into account the existence to-day of an international authority. The idea, for instance, that just as it was impossible in pre-war days to determine with certitude which of two States engaging in war was really the "aggressor," so it will always remain impossible to do so, is unsound. A resolute League of Nations Council (especially if it has the help of such an engagement as the Convention for Improving Means of Preventing War) can use a peace-keeping technique which virtually compels the self-exposure of a State which means to gamble on the success of violence.

THE TIES OF PEACE

The society of nations ought to be able to make its services so indispensable to its members that they will not be able to afford to dispense with them. Already the peace-building services rendered to the world suprernationally, through an international Civil Service, are much more extensive than the world realizes; they ought to be popularized. And we have, I believe, hardly begun

to envisage what invaluable services might be rendered to the world community by a disinterested Civil Service and an evolving organization which could serve for certain purposes as a federal authority. Already the cautious beginnings of a pooled system of legislative power can be traced; and this process can be expedited even now, without waiting for the development of a more representative world authority. The Governments, for instance, can and do delegate to international bodies certain powers to act on their behalf for certain limited purposes.

RENUNCIATION OF WAR

Another of the necessary contributions to the system of world security is unqualified renunciation of war. Sceptics may regard the Kellogg Pact as an empty gesture; and they can point to the damning fact that already in the few years since its signature two wars in South America and one in Asia have been fought between its signatories. Certainly, the Pact is a weakly thing by itself, lacking, as it does, any machinery for making its operation effective. Yet it is fair, I think, to claim that in conjunction with the Covenant the Pact is proving a potent force on the side of peace.

It is helping to create a new social ethic as to the right of war. It is compelling the nations, especially the United States, to face more realistically the question: "What is the real price of peace?" and "What is that something which a nation may legitimately defend?" Above all, it is forcing the nations, within the League and outside it, to realize that the evolution of a peaceful world order must needs be blocked directly and indirectly

in a thousand ways, so long as nations retain liberty to be their own judges of their claims to "self-defence." The Pact should enable us to kill that anarchic survival, the right of self-judged self-defence.

THE BRITISH BLOW TO THE KELLOGG PACT

It should be realized that the British Conservative Government of 1929, in accepting the Pact, dealt it a blow which might have proved fatal, and has, in fact, had very damaging consequences. By the so-called "British Monroe Doctrine," we reserved "freedom of action" in "certain regions of the world," unspecified, whose "welfare and integrity" we might regard as of "special and vital interest for our peace and safety." That claim, advanced to safeguard the conveniences of imperialist policy in the Suez Canal zone and elsewhere, could be cited as an example by others. It was so cited by Japan as an excuse for her policy in Manchuria; it ought to be repudiated formally, if there is any chance of its revival.

The renunciation of war ought, of course, to cover any equivalent of war. Japan's conquest of Manchuria is not saved from being a violation of the Pact simply because war was not formally declared. The renunciation of force "as an instrument of national policy" is a vague formula; but it can help, with the aid of an international authority, towards the evolution of new standards of international behaviour. It can help, for instance, to kill American interventionism, and it may stimulate a change of British policy in regard to the status of the Suez Canal zone and the North-West Frontier of India.

MACHINERY FOR PEACEFUL SETTLEMENT

The Kellogg Pact is a negative engagement: its signatories are bound never to seek a solution of their disputes "except by pacific means," but they are not bound to submit to or accept a pacific settlement. Nor does the Covenant definitely prescribe pacific *settlement*: it only requires, in regard to all disputes "likely to lead to rupture," that they shall be submitted to pacific procedure; that certain classes of disputes are "generally suitable" for legal decision; that the right to begin a private war must in all cases be deferred till peaceful procedure has been fully tried; and that in some circumstances, even the ultimate, conditional right of war must be renounced. Hence the enormous importance of the great multilateral treaties of pacific settlement, such as the Optional Clause and the General Act. It is of the first importance that all nations should accept in advance a third party's judgment in regard to all their international disputes of whatever kind.

DEFECTS IN PEACE MACHINERY

To this the critic may reply: "Look at the reservations which Great Britain and other Powers have made in accepting the Optional Clause; are they not potentially extremely damaging, introducing a weakening element of vagueness and uncertainty into the commitment." I agree; I should like to see the reservations got rid of. The critic may add: "Look at the General Act; is it not a very defective text, with its deliberate omission of all reference to the League's convenient machinery, and its unduly rigid and rapid provisions about submission to

arbitral decision, if conciliation breaks down?" Again I agree; I should like to see the Act improved. Some critics may say further: "Will not this insistence on pacific settlement, on the basis of existing rights, mean a perilous and unjust crystallization of the *status quo* unless and until better provision is made for peaceful change?" I agree that peaceful change is indispensable, but I believe that the shortcomings of existing provisions for peaceful change are not legitimately advanced as an excuse for refusal to extend the rule of law and the principle of third-party judgment.

PROVISION FOR PEACEFUL CHANGE

As for the great problem of peaceful change, it is plain, in the first place, that provision for *change* of the existing international situation is *indispensable*. Merely to erect barriers against war is not enough: without "justice"—a justice which takes account of national loyalties and racial memories—peace cannot be secure. The hope of change by peaceful means, according to the judgment of reason, must not be baulked too long, or statesmanship will be faced again with the old problem: "How shall we concede to menace what we refused to concede to reasoned appeal?" The promise of such change must be real, not a mere sop to keep the impatient quiet.

Secondly, this change must be truly *peaceful*, in the sense of being negotiated without the use of menace. The moment that the language of menace is used, compromises and concessions become more difficult to offer; negotiation is hampered by new apprehensions; unrestrainable forces begin to array themselves on one side against immovable opposition on the other.

It is easy for a citizen of a “sated” empire to say these things. Perhaps, if I were a Hungarian, I should be even more conscious than I am that fear of war or of pressure not far short of war will only too probably be the one spur that will drive statesmen into tackling the problem of change. Nevertheless, it remains true that war is the worst of all possible methods of change—worse by far than the blind judgment of a spun coin, heads or tails; and that reason and sympathetic understanding, since we cannot fall back on a comfortably infallible oracle, afford the best means of adjustment we possess. Hitler was right (let us hope he was also fully sincere) when he said in his speech in the Reichstag of May 17, 1933: “No fresh European war is capable of putting something better in the place of the unsatisfactory conditions which to-day exist. On the contrary, neither politically nor economically could the use of any kind of force in Europe create a more favourable situation than exists to-day.” As Lord Cecil has said: “War . . . may create a state of flux out of which new conditions may be shaped; but in doing so it creates a temper in which the right use of new opportunities is most difficult and improbable. If we fancy that we can truly serve freedom, democracy, or justice by breaking the peace, we shall deceive ourselves as blindly as those who fought the ‘wars of religion’ in the name of Christ.”

NEED FOR REVISION OVERESTIMATED

Thirdly, the real extent of the present case for change of the most difficult kind, territorial change, is greatly exaggerated by propaganda. I cannot attempt here to

discuss the claims of Hungary, or of Germany, or Italy, or Japan, or China, or Bolivia, or the aspirations of the Ukrainians, the Georgians, the peoples of India. But I believe it is fair to say that a great proportion of the sweeping claims often made for revision of the territorial provisions of the Peace Treaties of 1919 cannot really be sustained on grounds of justice and nationality. Some of us have laboured since 1919 to show that the Peace Treaties were unjust in many of their provisions, and inexcusable in their manner of preparation. I believe that the lie of Germany's sole war guilt, in so far as it has ever been officially affirmed, ought to be denounced; that certain territories ethnographically Hungarian and contiguous to Hungary ought to be restored, and that some changes will have to be made as regards Danzig and the Corridor. Further, I cannot defend the virtual prohibition of the Austro-German Anschluss. But I venture to believe also that much of the existing feeling about, say, the Polish Corridor is based on obsolete conceptions of the sacredness and importance of national sovereignty; that for Germany or anyone else to risk a European war in the hope of recovering sovereignty over the Corridor would be to do criminal injury to the major interests of Germany; and that the feeling itself has been exacerbated by propagandists who have sought, by inflaming the passion of which they warn us, to make their hopes come true.

Assume, then, that provision for peaceful change is necessary, but that such change, especially when it concerns the territorial *status quo*, is necessarily a perilous business, not to be attempted too soon or left till too late. What ought to be done about it?

I have only space for a bare indication of five ways of dealing with the situation.

REDUCE THE NEED OF CHANGE

First, we can help to reduce the need for change. To lay stress on that is not to dodge the real issue. I do not advocate that statesmen should try to pacify the revisionists by an exasperating incantation: "We will stabilize your frontiers." But we can do a great deal to eliminate the case for irredentist propaganda, by extending the principle of the Minorities Treaties; by ensuring the adequate application of those Treaties; by extending the Mandates principle to colonial possessions; by general disarmament and the elimination of universal compulsory military service; and so on.

Furthermore, we can do much, by offering voluntary changes, to deflate exaggerated notions of the importance of territorial sovereignty and "possession." Even a few gestures by Great Britain such as the voluntary offer to cede Cyprus to Greece, gestures proposed simply on their own merits and not as part of a bargain, would do much to "debunk" the old idea that England's "greatness" is measurable by the redness of the map, and to substitute more sensible humanistic values for the crude values of possessive imperialism.

EXTENSION OF THE DISCRETION OF THE PERMANENT COURT

Another line of advance would be to extend the judicial discretion of the Permanent Court. Every State has in some way to adjust the conflict between the rigidity of law and the changing needs and conceptions of justice; and this adjustment is effected partly by the exercise

of judicial discretion, partly by legislative action. The Permanent Court might, perhaps, be empowered, when giving its legal decisions on the basis of existing law, to express an opinion as to the appropriateness and justice of the legal position; and such a pronouncement might have the effect of suspending execution of the judgment pending consideration of the matter by the League.

DECISIONS ON AN EQUITY BASIS

Yet another way of solving the problem—the most radical way—is for States to entrust to an international authority the task of giving a decision *ex aequo et bono*, i.e. not simply on the basis of existing law, but on broad grounds of equity. Provision has been made for this in a number of treaties, notably in one between Italy and Switzerland. If conciliation fails, then, according to the Swiss-Italian Treaty, the dispute may be brought before the Court for settlement *ex aequo et bono*. It must be recognized, however, that a body of ageing lawyers in the Permanent Court, however pre-eminent in legal knowledge and authority, may not be a complete, or even the best, treasury of the riches of human understanding and statesmanship. It may be that, for the working out of settlements involving hardly accepted compromises, a special Commission appointed *ad hoc* would afford a better prospect of an agreed solution.

AUTHORITY OF REPORTS BY THE COUNCIL

Another method, which has been suggested at Geneva, would be to give binding force in the last resort to a unanimous report by the League Council, the votes of the disputants not being counted. It may be noted, in

this connection, that the Report of the Lytton Commission was in effect an essay in peaceful change. Its recommendations would have involved drastic changes of the legal *status quo*, proposed on grounds of equity and balance of advantage. It has not been accepted by Japan; and it is obvious that in such cases, unless the League's members are determined to honour their obligations to prevent the principle of violence, no report by any authority, however impartial and wise, will be given a fair chance of acceptance by the recalcitrant party.

ARTICLE XIX OF THE COVENANT

Lastly, there is Article XIX of the League Covenant, the article which expressly contemplates the collective reconsideration of treaties which have become "inapplicable," or of conditions "whose continuance might endanger the peace of the world." Under this article enquiry may be made, and the League can then "advise" a solution on the basis of a report. That is all that the Covenant actually provides. But the League is in fact evolving certain rudimentary powers of a legislative character. It is not nearly so hamstrung by the rule of unanimity as is commonly supposed; and, whilst there is obviously no short cut to making the League into a federal authority for certain purposes, or to making the Assembly into a proportionally representative body, its legislative function can even now be gradually extended as the League grows stronger. We shall go on appointing international authorities empowered for certain purposes, a Disarmament Commission, an Opium Commission, a Bank of International Settlements, or an Air Transport Union, and in doing so we shall be adding bricks, almost

unnoticed, to the structure of world government, which is insensibly growing up while we deny its possibility.

NEW CONCEPT OF SECURITY

The most fundamental change of thinking we have to bring about is in regard to "security." Steadily we should be sapping the old conception of a "security" which meant for each State the assurance that it could make its own will prevail in the last resort by the strength of its own right arm. Every Navy League, Empire League, and Air League lives on that conception. To its members security means supremacy for their own country, whose position is always regarded as unique. Steadily we ought to be substituting, for this anarchic, self-destroying conception of security, the conception of a collective security against the common enemy, war and war's equivalent. Without this new conception Disarmament Conferences will amount to little more than a juggling with the handicaps in the armaments race. Unless the principle of collective responsibility for peace and justice among the nations, which has been so shaken by the Sino-Japanese disaster, is restored, this League will never grow up into a world commonwealth.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO SECURITY

The new conception of security has to be built up in two ways, positive and negative. Moral disarmament, renunciation of war, freedom of the seas, military and economic disarmament, the supersession of the vested interests in war, the protection of minority rights, provisions for a reliable test of aggression and for the im-

position of an armistice, financial assistance to States threatened with or victims of attack, the internationalization of civil aviation, and international supervision of disarmament; all these are amongst the contributions which may be made towards positive security. We can if we will build such a peace that none but the blindest fool will want to smash it. But we haven't built it yet. While we are getting on with the work of positive peace-building, what are we to do about the more negative measures to prevent and to stop peace-breaking?

HOW TO MAKE SANCTIONS EFFECTIVE

I will not stop to discuss the ethical or the political problem of sanctions; I will assume that an effective sanction, to prevent or stop war and its equivalent with the minimum of enduring injury, is morally legitimate and politically required. What of the technical problem of making such a sanction effective and practicable? The sanctions must be such as to act as an adequate deterrent to those who might contemplate attack; they must afford reliable assurance to those who might be attacked; and they must be a tolerable burden to those who may have to contribute to the coercive measures they involve. I believe that these conditions can be fulfilled if, but only if, the sanctions are part of a system in which they are least likely to be required; that is, a system in which the League's collective principle is loyally supported (especially by Great Britain), and which involves radical disarmament, and includes wide provision for peaceful settlement, peaceful change, and positive security. I believe, too, though I cannot here discuss the point, that the Covenant's provisions about

preventive sanctions, before war has been formally resorted to, might with advantage be clarified and strengthened; but that it would be dangerous to attempt any substantial recasting of the sanctions provisions at a time when isolationist tendencies are strong, as they are in Great Britain.

It is an illusion to suppose that we can leap in one bound from the anarchic world of unrestricted private war into the world of spontaneous universal non-resistance and freedom from violence. If we want a world order, a system of pooled security to ensure what the Covenant calls "the peace of nations" is part of the price we must pay.

Disarmament

I come lastly to disarmament, the most urgently needed part of the whole enterprise. Without disarmament, security against war and the confidence necessary for economic recovery are alike impracticable. Without disarmament, our treaties of renunciation of war and peaceful settlement, our rudimentary provisions for peaceful change, must remain ineffective. If we want a world order, we must pay this price, too—the renunciation of the means to disorder.

As I write, the last stage of the long negotiations of the first World Disarmament Treaty is about to begin; by the time this is printed the Conference may have broken down, as many people now expect that it will. There are many who, faced by the German and the Japanese challenge, would like to see the whole enterprise adjourned. Disarmament, they say, is impossible until

Hitlerism and Japanese militarism are discredited. Germany is rearming now; what is the use, they say, of making fresh engagements with her?

THE FIRST DISARMAMENT CONVENTION

I believe that to be a policy that inevitably leads to disaster. The alternative policy is difficult; it requires forbearance and skill; but it does offer hope of a successful beginning.

Here are five conditions which ought, I suggest, to be fulfilled in this first Treaty.

LIMITATION OF ARMS

First, the Treaty must provide comprehensive *limitation* of armaments. That is not a poor thing; on the contrary, it would be an invaluable achievement, as a means of checking the competition which is at present for the most part quite unlimited. It is very important that the limitation should include limitation (as well as mere publicity) of expenditure. But this may be blocked by the opposition of the United States, of Germany, and perhaps of Great Britain. Nevertheless, limitation of expenditure is a necessary counter-check on direct limitation and the *only* means of limiting certain classes of armament.

Limitation should in particular be applied to the numbers of mobile guns that the armies may retain. As matters stand, these will be left unlimited in number.

Furthermore, limitation upon arms manufactures should be enforced by means of licences, under supervision of the Permanent Disarmament Commission.

REDUCTION AND PROHIBITION OF ARMS

Secondly, the Treaty should provide for drastic and progressive reduction of arms. The British proposals for standardization of European armies on a basis of short-service enlistment (for eight months only) will, if accepted, mean, I believe, an important net reduction of Europe's armed men, and of the readiness of the armies to strike a sudden, efficient blow. But these gains may be offset if the Treaty is not loyally applied (e.g. in its application to the irregular forces in Germany) or if there were a counterbalancing increase in the mechanization of war. The Treaty ought to provide for an agreement on the abolition within a fixed period of all the weapons that were prohibited for Germany at Versailles. It ought to, but it certainly won't. In particular, it ought to provide for abolition, within, say, five years or ten, of all naval and military aviation. Without that, there is no chance of securing "no rearmament" in the air by Germany. If we go on with the present lunatic race for air supremacy, disaster will be hanging always over the nerve centres of civilization. The Treaty should provide too for abolition within a fixed period of all tanks. Abolition of tanks on *both* sides of the world's frontiers is infinitely safer for the world's peace than their retention on both sides and the inevitable rearmament of Germany. (I say, the Treaty *should* provide these things. I know it will not, for the British War Office and the French will prevent it. In face of the demand for abolition by almost every nation in the world, Lord Hailsham will insist on retaining this "protection to human life" (the tank) which, in his words, will "enable

the infantry to be conveyed to the suppression of machine-guns without undue loss of life"!)

The Treaty should provide, too, for abolition of all mobile land guns of over $4\frac{1}{2}$ inches calibre (that being about the size of the largest guns allowed to Germany). But it won't. As matters stand, it will allow Germany's neighbours to retain all the 6-inch guns they have got, without replacement, but without limit of numbers. Even this will be difficult to win, I expect, from France under present conditions.

ABOLITION OF WARSHIPS

The Treaty ought to provide not only for suppression of the preparation and use of chemical and incendiary war (as it already does, after a fashion), but also for the abolition within a fixed period of warships over 10,000 tons (6,500 would be a much better maximum) and submarines. But it won't. It won't even provide for non-replacement of the large ships. The British Admiralty is bent on replacing these with ships of tonnages in the neighbourhood of 23,000 or 25,000 tons; and the best we can hope for now, it seems, is that a decision will be postponed for the present in the hope that by 1935 the demand for abolition, or, failing that, non-replacement, will have become irresistible.

Thirdly, the Treaty ought to provide for no rearmament. But that is unattainable unless we pay the price of it by levelling down to Germany's level.

COLLECTIVE SECURITY AGAINST WAR

Fourthly, the Treaty must provide for collective security against war and war's equivalent, and against breaches

of the Treaty. In particular, its provisions for a Permanent Disarmament Commission should be strengthened, so that the Commission's investigations on the spot, instead of being made only in the event of alleged breaches, take place periodically and as a matter of course. It would be most damaging if Britain, Germany, or Italy were to block such a recommendation. The manufacture of and traffic in arms must in any case be regulated under international supervision. That is the least that would serve as a security instalment. But besides that, all manufacture of arms for private profit ought to be suppressed, as the French and others urge.

WHY SUPPRESSION OF PRIVATE MANUFACTURE IS OPPOSED

It ought to be, but I fear it won't be. The British Government, backed by Japan, Germany, Italy, America, and Belgium, blocks the way, because, as Lord Hailsham says, the private industry gives us the inestimable advantage of a cheap and rapid capacity for the expansion of our armament production in a crisis. The British policy is thus designed to neutralize that time-lag between a crisis and a crash which the Disarmament Treaty ought to promote. Meanwhile our arms manufacturers and the Americans do not scruple to supply the bankrupt Bolivians and the hardly less bankrupt Paraguayans with the means of killing each other, whilst the British and American Governments were officially seeking to stop the fight.

But one cannot indicate in a few sentences the evil that results from this trade in death. One can only hope the British electorate will soon know the facts and resent them sufficiently to ensure that no British Government

will ever again defend the manufacture of arms for private profit, or suffer its Ministers to hold office whilst holding shares in armament firms (as Lord Hailsham and others did till recently).

EQUALITY ESSENTIAL

Lastly, the Treaty should provide for equality of rights and equality of treatment, so that it may be freely accepted by all. It is, of course, difficult to stand now as we once did for equality of treatment, with the object lesson of Hitler's Germany before us. No Treaty that we can hope to offer now will be drastic enough to rob Hitler of all opportunity of exploiting its inadequacy as a grievance. But the concession of elementary justice is still the best policy. The one hope of winning Germany's collaboration is to abandon wholly the insufferable discrimination made at Versailles between those nations which could and those which could not be trusted with certain weapons. We cannot now go back on the declaration of December 11, 1932: that one of the guiding principles of the Treaty should be "equality of rights in a system which would provide security for all nations." "For all nations"; for Germany no less than for France and Poland.

How is that principle to be realized? Presumably the best hope of agreement lies now in providing, first, for arms supervision forthwith, and, secondly, for making the curve of material reduction a flat one in the early years of the Treaty, but steepening later on. It is essential to provide definitely now for reductions, otherwise there will be no hope of winning through to a

later stage of loyal collaboration in progressive disarmament.

HALF A LOAF . . .

Does it seem that a Treaty on such lines as these would be a trumpery beginning? I agree that it would be far less than we had a right to hope for, far less than we might have had, granted courageous leadership. But I do believe it would be a beginning of great potential value; and I am sure that the breakdown which is its alternative would be disastrous.

THE DISARMAMENT OBJECTIVE

Finally, the question may be raised, What ought we to be aiming at as an objective in disarmament? I suggest that this will do to be getting on with: The abolition of all armaments in the world except such as may still be genuinely required in special cases to prevent breaches of the public peace. There is much to be said for creating a small air force of a protective type, under international authority, provided that the various national air forces are wholly abolished. There is a strong case, too, for reducing the world's navies to the status of a collective naval gendarmerie. The difficulties of constituting and stationing an international land force are, I believe, insuperable, at least for a long while to come. But for the present all that is ahead of us. Our business now is to concentrate effort on securing for the first time a World Disarmament Treaty in which the armaments of the world will be recognized as the world's concern. It is important not to underrate the significance of that beginning. It would sap the citadel of that ancient

MANIFESTO

fortress, the absolute sovereignty of States; it would make possible a new social ethic, in which "security" will stand, not for the supremacy of this brigand-State over that, but for the collective security of the world commonwealth against violence and injustice.

September 1933

CHAPTER IV

WHAT SHALL I DO IN THE NEXT WAR?

by

FRANCIS MEYNELL

“War resistance on the part of individuals in the event
of an outbreak of hostilities.”

The Basis of the Federation of Progressive Societies
and Individuals.

CHAPTER IV

WHAT SHALL I DO IN THE NEXT WAR?

A SHORT ANSWER

It is a commonplace that pain is quickly forgotten. Since we remember chiefly by words, and no words are adequate for the pain and shock and misery of war, we have not the materials for a vivid memory. Those who suffered intolerably for weeks or months or even years in the last war are apt to remember, now that the suffering is behind them, no more than the joke about the parson's trousers or the girl they found in the ruined farm. There is, therefore, no effective appeal for the avoidance of war which can be made to the recollection of those who fought in the last war; still less, though for other reasons, to that of those who, like myself, were pacifists and "conscientious objectors."

What, as things are, I shall probably do in the next war can be stated in a few score words. In a war of surprise air-raids on the devastating scale for which every country is preparing, it is not so much a question of what I shall do, as of what will be done to me. For there will be no sure or probable way of "getting out from under"; from under the enemy's bomb, or from under one's own country's proscription, or from under the fury of a mob persuaded to believe that those who lead them into peril are their saviours and those who lead them away from it their enemies.

Since the last war the technique of attack, whether it be the attack of nations upon their enemies by means

of bombs and the poison of chemicals, or whether it be the attack of Governments on their own peoples by means of suppression and the poison of propaganda, has advanced infinitely further than the technique of defence. In the last war the actuarial value of a conscientious objector's life must have been very much higher than that of a soldier's or even a sailor's. In the next the civilian will be in at least as much danger as the infantry; and, if he be a pacifist, he will face the added perils of his own State and mob law.

My reply to the question which heads this chapter is, then, that, while I shall not by any deliberate act contribute to the process of fighting, I do not expect to escape thereby. My part will be quite passive (*Latin, patior = I suffer*).

BUT INADEQUATE

But that reply, though definite, is not adequate. It is necessary for me to justify that passivity, not only to myself but to others, if it is to have any social value. The pacifist must examine his case, and what the Tribunals insisted on calling his "conscience"; he must be sure of the ground, intellectual, moral, and emotional, on which he is prepared to take his stand and urges others to take their stand. For it is certainly possible that that ground will also carry a gallows.

And his first need is to realize how little a mere pacifist conviction will avail him when war hysteria comes. "If man will think, he will not fight." But at the threat of war, under the strain and stress of emotion, thought gives way. The most surprising ignominies of the last war were the intellectual ignominies. It is worth while

recalling a few of them now, not for the purpose of jeering at their authors, but as a warning of what befalls better brains than yours and mine, when once war madness is let loose.

WAR HYSTERIA

One is almost staggered to recall the mindless hysteria which swept over England, the complete abrogation of the familiar standards of the critical intelligence which occurred when war was imminent, and still more when it was declared and as it progressed. For years everyone had been saying that a war with Germany was inevitable, that it must be fought for the supremacy of the seas, for the expansion of trade, for a place in the sun, for colonies, for bread. For years it had been preached that Germany would strike at France through Belgium. Yet, when the war came, it was the invasion of Belgium which was presented as the unthinkable crime. That was the factor which Mr. Lloyd George declared to have determined him, and which was of enormous influence in determining public opinion as a whole. Nothing else could have caused us to enter upon this "inevitable" war; that at least was what the masses believed. In forty-eight hours it was forgotten that Lord Grey had refused to promise the German Ambassador that we should remain neutral provided that the neutrality of Belgium was respected; that he refused, indeed, to promise neutrality on any terms.

It is to be observed that it was our own Imperialists, and the French "Revanche" partisans, who most consistently preached the "holy war" against militarism; just as it was our privileged classes who were inspired to

“make the world safe for democracy.” Not even the fact that we had as allies Czarist Russia and Japan makes me believe that these appeals were deliberately cynical. They were assuredly self-deceiving appeals; they were assuredly the result of war hysteria.

ATROCITIES, ANGELS, RUSSIANS, SPIES

As we went on, fuel was constantly added to the fires of our moral indignation. There were the seemingly well-attested tales of the cutting off of Belgian children’s hands, which millions believed (my own responsible-minded parents among them), though not one authentic case was ever produced. There was the sausage factory in which the enemy were said to turn corpses to account for the production of grease or, as it was more than whispered, for the satisfaction of their gourmands. There was the hanging of the Belgian priests from the belfry—a tale of which the origin and the embellishment for propaganda purposes was traced after the war. This was at least founded on fact. But it was a chime of new bells, not a chime of venerable priests, that was hung.

And all this was believed against every probability, against experience, against all reason. It seemed that there were no limits to the credulity of what used to be a sober and somewhat sceptical people. There were those Angels of Mons, a feature of a piece of avowed fiction by Mr. Machen, to the truth of which, despite the inventor’s protestations, troops of eye-witnesses were cited, and in which millions believed. There were the Russian troops which came through England, shaking off the snow (yes, I heard it again and again myself) from their boots as they stepped off the English train.

Spies were believed to be harboured, one remembers, by such people as Mr. Asquith. The House of Commons debated at length the case of an Orientalist of seventy-five who, despite the facts that he had forty years before sought refuge in England to escape Prussianism and had done expert work for the British Government ever since, was suspected of being a secret agent of Prussia. Mr. George Cadbury's house was visited and searched for evidence of espionage, and information was laid against another gentleman because he had letters from abroad and was seen hunting for slugs in his garden with a lantern. Every concrete tennis court (even Mr. Arnold Bennett, as his diary attests, was not proof against this suggestion) was a long-prepared German gun emplacement.

BOTTOMLEY AND THE FEAST OF UNREASON

These are but a few of the thousand examples that could be cited of the dethronement of reason, deliberate as it almost seems to us to-day, for the period of the war. Is it not enough by way of recapitulation to say that Horatio Bottomley was given official status, and accepted by the multitude, as an authority not only on the purposes of England, but also on the purposes of God? Was not this canting and sanctimonious charlatan able to bring home more convincingly than any other single man to the minds of the people the conviction of the rightness of our cause, of the diabolic nature of the enemy and of the consequent necessity for "joining up" and "carrying on" to the bitter end? A few hours before war was declared his posters bore the legend "To hell with Serbia." A few hours afterwards he changed his tune—though not his note—and held it to the end of the war. Though

it may not be becoming for a layman to compete in matters of morals with a priest of the Christian Church, it must be recorded that he outdid even Father Bernard Vaughan's slogan of "Kill more Germans." Patriotism for him was not the last but the first refuge of a scoundrel. His efforts, remember, were official; he was conveyed about the country and to the Front at public expense and under official patronage.

All this folly, this dementia, could be duplicated in Germany, in France, and, with appropriate variations, in every other belligerent country. And there was no wireless with its insinuating, its masterful, its uninterrupted voice, in those days to do its work of authoritarian propaganda. . . .

What hope was there then, what hope will there be in the next war, of thinking out the problems involved, of calmly determining our own attitude, of influencing others by the rational spoken word? It is difficult enough to cope with the unreason induced by the very thought of war even in days of peace. Unaided memory, I have said above, will not save us.

HONOURING THE DEAD!

In those days we were told that the Great War was fought to end war; and the most seductive of all the arguments was summed up in the phrase "Never again." Very well! Recently a very large number of the young men at our Universities have pushed that argument to its logical conclusion by passing the simple and precise resolution: "We will not fight for King and Country." There was purpose, not wantonness, in the terms of that resolution. "King and Country" stands for the blind

appeal to patriotism. Those who supported that resolution made not so much a confession of pacifist faith as a claim to consider and judge the true issues of a war. Whatever the issue, King and Country will be again, as always before, the cloak. They did not even say, "Never again." They said, "Never blindly again." Yet Mr. Garvin considers their action an insult to the dead, of whom he was the first to proclaim that "they died that their sons might live." And when their sons, their still precariously living sons, say, "We respect that trust. We will keep the peace that you died to make. We will not only live, but we insist on continuing to let live," they are said to be insulting the dead. Meanwhile, presumably, Mr. Winston Churchill is honouring the dead when he holds up the blue-eyed German military youth to our admiration and urges at the same time our own blue-eyed military youth to prepare to blind those admirable blue eyes.

And Sir Philip Sassoon doubtless honours them when he speaks of the Air Force as useful for the "humane bombing" of recalcitrant tribes; and so refuses an attainable and (since it would remove a definite *cause* of war, the desire to strike suddenly lest suddenly you be struck) substantial measure of disarmament. And honour to the dead, it is to be believed, exudes also from Sir John Simon, who for over a year and a half said that Japan was not at war with China, because war is not war until certified as a war by the League of Nations—as if a murdered man were not dead until after the coroner's inquest.

It is, then, because of the hysteria, because of the intellectual paralysis caused not merely by the coming of war, but by its very mention, that the "debunking"

process so laudably begun by those young men at the Universities is essential now, and that we should each one of us face the problem and decide what we think and what we must do, not only when war "comes," but before.

WHAT KIND OF PACIFISM?

My own recusancy about war, I say at once, is not the product of a pacifist philosophy. I have every respect, nay more, much sympathy for those whose ground is the Biblical injunction, "Thou shalt not kill." They have no need to account further for their pacifism, though modern psychology does not exempt them from the duty of examining and mistrusting their motives. Their creed has been simply and splendidly stated for them, and, though few may, as they do, act upon it, all are presumed to render it lip-service. But that is not the ground upon which I stand, for I do not believe in Inspiration, and I do not believe that the use of force, even to the length of killing, is always and inevitably wicked. It is for this reason that I feel bound to make abundantly clear to myself, and not only to myself, the basis of my pacifism. I hold, then, that any war which I can conceive involves such infinite evil to humanity as to outweigh any possible chance of good that might result from it.

WHAT KIND OF WAR?

What kinds of war are, in fact, conceivable?

There is the patriotic war, the old-style war of nationalism, of which the Great War was a specimen. It springs from the pitting of one set of national ideals, aims, and ambitions against another set. It stirs the fanatical passions of the peoples; it commands the devoted adherence of

scores of millions of sane people, arrayed in bitter enmity against each other. The Church in every country denounces the enemy as barbarians, as devils incarnate. It becomes the duty of German Christians to kill the English, and of English Christians to kill the Germans.

God heard the embattled nations sing and shout,
“Gott strafe England” and “God save the King,”
God this, God that, and God the other thing.
“Good God,” said God, “I’ve got my work cut out!”

MY COUNTRY RIGHT OR WRONG

The patriotism that can produce this tragic folly stands self-convicted. If “My country right or wrong” is an appropriate motto for the Englishman, it must be equally appropriate for the enemies of England. I imagine that most people who use this formula still do so with a mental reservation. In England at least, where the sanctity of the corporative state is not yet a popular doctrine. They mean, not that what they believe to be wrong becomes right if the Government says so, but rather that their country is, in fact, always right. Such people believe that their national institutions and habits are so valuable that it is right to uphold them on all occasions, even in a quarrel which seems on the face of it to be unjust; even if it involves forcibly converting less favoured nations to the true gospel for their own good. This argument closely resembles the case for a war of self-defence, of which I shall have more to say presently. But the type of war which exploits this motive—a purely nationalistic war—is, nevertheless, apt (since nations now function primarily as trading units) to be a war for markets. “My oil-fields right or wrong!” would be a truer blazon

for its banners. But propaganda departments know better than that. (The candour of "Trade follows the flag" belongs to the days when a war was not a war but merely a wiping out of natives.) A fine moral issue is put in the shop window, but a foul commerce is carried on in the back parlour. The division of booty after the last war, fought, it will be remembered, for "Little Belgium," took singularly little account of the fact that there was a little Belgium at all. . . .

WARS OF SELF-DEFENCE

Then there is the war of self-defence, the war against the unprovoked "mad dog." Surely this at least is a just war, and in fighting it we are merely refusing to submit to the arbitrament of force? But in every war every country concerned always claims that it is fighting in self-defence. Ultimately that is the only way in which national unanimity can be assured. But what is it that we actually defend by fighting? The defence must, presumably, be of our lives and of the conditions of life that we enjoy. La Fontaine's tame bear was defending its master when it crushed the bee upon his bald head with a rock and, incidentally, killed him. I can undoubtedly save my house from burglars by burning its contents. I can cure my cold by cutting off my head. If one thing has become clear from the record of past wars, it is that the lives and the conditions which are defended are always imperilled and often utterly destroyed by the defence of arms. How often has any nation attacked another which it did not think it could defeat? Even if I am quite sure that the lives I want to preserve will be preserved, and those which I do not

value so highly will alone be endangered; even if I am quite sure that the conditions of life in my own country are superior to those in all others, and especially in that of the attackers' country; even in that event I believe that I can attain my ends better by refusing to submit them to the hazardous arbitrament of war. In cold fact, those who use the argument of self-defence usually mean: "You must risk your life and the conditions you enjoy to preserve my life and the conditions I enjoy." Only the totally innocent, the totally unprovocative country can claim fairly that its war would be a war of self-defence, and, therefore, just, if not politic. But to be wholly innocent and totally unprovocative a country must be without arms of offence. And since modern conditions made defence impossible, the one country that might be justified in fighting would be the one country which would be mad to fight. For the justice of its cause would not enable it to escape the horror of conquest and defeat.

THE SHAM LEAGUE WAR

Of late a new and more specious type of just war has been envisaged. It is a so-called police war by the League of Nations on some nation which it adjudges to be criminal. Of this I can only say that, while the League is controlled by Foreign Secretaries pursuing the nationalistic aims of their respective Governments, I am sceptical of such policing. I do not believe that it is practicable, and I do not believe that justice would be its aim if it were. To arm the League, as it is at present composed, would be like pooling the gunmen of the rival gangsters in America. But I can imagine a different League of

Nations, a very different, in whose police force I would, in fact, consent to serve.

Recent events in Germany have inspired one group of political thinkers, as earlier events in Russia inspired another, with the idea of a war waged by one people on the political institutions of another. It is hardly necessary to elaborate the reasons why I would take no part in such a war. If I could pass over the unwarrantable interference with the right of a people to settle its own institutions; if I could be sure that a weapon used ostensibly for institutions that I admire would not at some time be used against them, I should still be sure that the cruelties in detail, and the uncertainties of all forms of mass warfare constituted the worst possible means for deciding the form of society under which people ought to live.

CIVIL AND CLASS WARS

Finally, I come to civil war. Rival principles of government or of economic organization come into conflict so sharply that there is, we will suppose, a resort to arms. The masses, perhaps, are reduced to starvation and revolt against the established order. Can I even then hold aloof? I admit that this is the most difficult case. There are special arguments both for and against participation in a class war which do not apply to national wars. The overthrowing of a tyranny, the defence of the under-dog, the liberation of the enslaved masses is a cause of which I, personally, cannot question the justice. And it is hard to see how one can meet some forms of tyranny except by violence; moreover, there are situations in which to do nothing is also to take a side. On the other

hand, a class war, at least in England, in any near or imaginable future, would be a war in which, above all others, there is the certainty of doing more harm than good. For, unless the technique of revolution developed by our Communists has recently improved out of all recognition, and unless our governing class is totally incapable of learning from Fascist Governments, an armed uprising of the proletariat would be a ghastly shambles. "We are many, ye are few," is a good argument for storming the Bastille, but a bad one for modern street fighting when one machine gun, one aeroplane, and one tank can kill all the "many" who happen to be in the streets—and the more the merrier. Death at the barricades in Vienna may be nobler, may even be less ghastly, than the endurance of "discipline" in a Nazi concentration camp. But that is not the object of war—to die nobly. The object of war is to kill plentifully, and so to establish one's policy. Judged by that realistic test, has democracy been better served in Vienna than in Berlin?

THE OBJECTIONS TO ALL WARS

Common to all these classes of war is a series of objections so close to one's face that it is hard to focus one's eyes upon them: the objections that the wrong people are killed, that the wrong cause is just as likely to prevail as the right—even if there is a clear wrong and right—and that in any event values are falsified and intellect debased. In short, war is the one certain way of reducing the good men (by which I mean the socially sensitive and useful men) and the bad, as also the good and the bad causes, to the same level.

These, then, are my reasons for refusing to fight in

any war whose likelihood I can conceive. But I have said earlier that I do not believe that I shall thereby escape from participation; and I am, in any event, not in favour of doing nothing. How I may be forced to participate, and what I may think it right to do, must in large measure depend on the character of the war.

THE CHARACTER OF THE NEXT WAR

In early days wars were sometimes settled by the single combat of champions. David and Goliath, by taking the risk themselves, saved a very large number of people from wounds and death. It is only quite recently in the history of mankind that wars, other than predatory expeditions by semi-barbaric chieftains or Roman generals and the like, have involved in imminent danger the whole population of at least one of the belligerent countries. Even in the Great War the direct risks of the civilians were very slight compared with those of the actual fighters. But the actual fighters constituted a far larger proportion than formerly of the manhood of the country; many thousands of women actively participated just behind the firing-lines, and there were few civilians who were completely immune from danger through bombs from the air or from at least some measure of privation, hardship, and risk to health and property.

Since the Great War the whole tendency of the development of military technique has been to increase the dangers of the civilian populations. It was not until the Great War was already well advanced that the ordinary daily life of the civilian was affected. In the next war it will be vitally affected within the first few hours. There will be no question of the will and the ability to rain

destruction from the air to an infinitely greater extent than in the Great War. Raids will not be a matter of a few explosive bombs, a building or two wrecked, a few dozen, or at most a few hundred people killed or injured. Whole districts and towns will be wiped out and their inhabitants poisoned. It will be useless to travel to Brighton from London every night—a habit not in the last war wholly unknown to some vociferous patriots.

The machinery of regimentation, too, will be far more perfect. Much has been learnt of the art of bringing the whole of a vast, modern population into line for a single purpose. In respect of munitions, of food, of civilian tasks generally, there will be far less liberty, far less uncertainty in the matter of control.

Whatever rules there may be in respect of prisoners of war, whatever restrictions upon the nature of weapons employed, whatever presumed alleviations of the tortures of the fighting forces, they will not apply to the civil populations.

All combatants will try from the start by every means to cripple the resources of their enemies. The armies will be far more easily defeated by cutting them off from food and munitions and destroying their sources of supply than by blowing them to pieces.

WHEN TO ACT

At what point, in such a war, is the pacifist to act, to declare himself, to make his protest? If he is enrolled in an acknowledged pacifist organization, it will be easy for the authorities to scotch him before he can do anything at all. That is why I am not in favour of such organizations, and why I am forced to the very unpleasant conclusion

that the pacifist will have to act, if war comes, as it probably will before he has won the world to his views, alone. He must not declare his revolt before the right time, or he will be a marked man and promptly silenced. He must, it is obvious, make his protest at the time and in the manner that will render it most effective. When and how, each must decide for himself. And one is not entitled to shirk the responsibility for this individual decision merely because one cannot be wholly consistent. In the last war objectors paid taxes and smoked cigarettes, both of which activities contributed to the war. In peace we do the same. All compromise of this kind is saved from ignominy if there is one sure point, our personal point of honour, beyond which we will not go. It may be putting on a uniform or submitting to a military medical examination; it may be replacing a man who is sent to war. The decision of each must be individual. What matters is that there should be a definite point, and that it should be determined, not only by the particular circumstances in which the individual finds himself, but also by the deep-rooted motives which govern his conduct.

SHIRKERS

A word may perhaps be permitted at this point on the moral obloquy of "shirkers." Pacifists are not, I think, especially prone to fear; equally, we are not immune from feelings common to all men and animals, and self-preservation is one of them. This should be understood even by the bellicose; understood and appreciated. If cowardice is a desire to preserve our lives and to respect the lives of others, neither we nor they should be ashamed

of the word. If war is sanctified as a means of preserving *our* country, *our* relatives and friends, is it cowardly to determine not to expose them and ourselves (after all, even we are *somebody's* friends!) to overwhelming peril? What is our country but the people who live in it and the free institutions they enjoy? To believe in, to support, a system which involves the periodical ravishing of our country, the slaughter of our countrymen and the suspension of our liberties, is not heroism, but plain folly. Moreover, if one thing is clear, it is that to stand against the herd mind, to oppose the whole might of the organized State, to face scorn, obloquy, cruelty, even (as I see it in the next war) the possibility of death with the public stigma of shame, is a curious course for a shirker to pursue. There are funk holes for the real shirker that are easier to enter than the prison cell, especially if it is the condemned cell.

WHAT TO DO NOW

I have painted a somewhat depressing picture of the position of the pacifist, if war were to come upon us now or at any time when the public mind is at the mercy of the war propagandist. I have done this because I believe it to be a true picture. I believe that the public mind is now set on peace; but I have no faith in its constancy. At cricket we "play the game." Nevertheless, virtually every Australian in 1932-33 was convinced that body-line bowling was an outrage, and every Englishman was convinced that it was legitimate, usual, and non-existent. That is what the Press can do to the public mind; even when it is working unofficially in peace time, about a game, and a game between blood-brothers. Hysteria

about test matches, affecting millions of people who have never seen a ball bowled, is not exactly a comforting augury for the dispassionate consideration of war issues. Nevertheless, at this moment, there is a stronger and more conscious will to peace than ever before. If there had not been, war would have "broken out" or "come" (to use the self-exculpatory expression of the war-minded) long since.¹ This, then, is our task: To make this peace-intention effective, to make it constant and unshakable. But how?

All responsible men claim to be pacifists of one kind or another, and it therefore becomes necessary to examine the methods by which it is generally suggested that peace should be assured.

Is there hope in a party attitude?

SI VIS PACEM, PARA BELLUM

The Conservative Party works upon its traditional principle of *si vis pacem, para bellum*. Be so strong that nobody dare attack you. Only so are you safe. And only so, presumably, is France or Russia or Italy safe. Only by everyone being stronger than anyone else is anyone safe. And—here is the closing of this most vicious circle—this their safety is this our peril; this our safety is this their peril.

This frank acceptance of fear as the only practical inducement to peace (and remember always it is reciprocal; if it is our enemy's fear that we count on, it is our

¹ Observe that babies also "come." Neither they nor wars are made. The vernacular is made to provide a cloak for the facts, and a denial of the responsibilities, of both bearing and killing.

fear that they count on) does not seem a very splendid doctrine for those who claim fearless moral splendour as their country's distinguishing virtue. And history has called the bluff and exposed the pretension a thousand times. Armament races have invariably ended in war.

THE COMMUNIST SOLUTION

At the opposite pole there is the Communist Party. Although it is generally assumed that war is "nationalist self-seeking," the Communist thinks otherwise. He holds that war is waged by a class, i.e. the capitalist class, for the purpose of defending property and facilitating exploitation. The worker, who owns no property, is not seeking his own interest by war, but simply securing his master's. The wars of predatory capitalism, it is maintained, are opposed in the long run to the interests of the propertyless class. The object of war is to invest capital in new fields, to gain access to raw materials and new markets, and as a result to increase production and the profits of the capitalists. That is the Communist analysis of war.

If we consider how far the Communist Party is effective as an anti-war party, we are bound to come in the end to the factor of quantity. So long as the Communist Party is in a small minority, it can never effectively resist war. To the argument that it can be made larger by pacifists joining it, the reply is that some kinds of pacifists cannot do so because they do not agree with its other tenets, and that others cannot because it is only opposed to national and not to civil war.

Somewhere politically between these two comes the

Labour Party, with its general resolutions of opposition to war and its specific inability to resist the doctrine of armaments and national prestige. A tragic joke in an American journal sums up this point of view. "You see, we've got to build our navy up to what other countries said they'd build theirs up to if we built ours up."

PEACE THROUGH FEAR

Scattered among the Conservative, Liberal, and Labour Parties are individuals who might call themselves practical pacifists. Some of them hold that what is needed is international *united action* to implement the common motive to peace. That motive must not be humanitarian. Appeals to kindness and morality are useless. The appeal (they say) must be to self-interest. The only way to get peace is to persuade the hard-hearted leaders of civilization that all nations are now in possession of weapons so powerful as to do irreparable damage to world trade the very instant war is declared. When business men realize that war means not merely the tearing up of thousands of young limbs, and the filling of thousands of babies' lungs with gas, but the destruction of the business centres of cities, of *their* offices, their ledgers, their files, of factories, and docks, and harbours—then they will see to it that war is avoided. They will realize that they can no longer go to their offices which control the China Seas when their offices are no longer there, and that their spheres of business influence in the China Seas, once lost, cannot be built up in a day; and they will see to it that world peace is maintained at all costs, not for humanitarian but for purely business reasons. In a

word, the world will, on this view, arrive at peace before it deserves it. Peace will be maintained, not because the world is morally advanced enough to desire it, but because it is degraded enough to have made war too dangerous.

ACTION BY THE LEAGUE TO HUMANIZE WAR

Other peace politicians hold quite a different view of what is likely to be the most effective common motive to induce the nations to take united action for peace. They believe that, while the appeal should be to humanitarianism, the methods must be strictly practical. The League of Nations can, they hold, by some alchemy cause the official representatives of warlike Governments, that is to say itself in its component parts, to become susceptible to this appeal.

Their immediate object is to outlaw at least some of the most horrible forms of war. But if fear is, after all, the best deterrent against war, this policy is suicidal: for if war is made less fearful it will be entered upon more lightly.

The motive seems creditable, but is it after all the case that to lighten the financial burden of armaments and to make war more polite is to make it less likely? Moreover, it may be doubted whether the motive is really as creditable as it appears. In some minds at least the reasoning, conscious or unconscious, is only too probably as follows: war must somehow be confined to the troops and to the trenches, and kept from the city and the seats of government. For myself, I cannot distinguish between the horror of killing a young man who likes his life,

and who by the compulsion of law or economics is a soldier, and the horror of killing a civilian, man or woman.

FUNCTION AND VALUE OF PACIFIST GROUP

Besides all these there are various groups rather than parties which call themselves pacifist. These may perform useful educational functions, and are in many cases, particularly in those spontaneous organizations of young people which have sprung up in the Universities and elsewhere, admirable. There may also be a small tactical advantage (at least in England and for a few years longer) in "frightening" the Government. It is possible that, while the forms of democracy persist, while politicians still look forward to another General Election, the pressure of loudly voiced public opinion may have some small effect in slowing down the armament race and modifying our national policy at Geneva. But already there are politicians who do not reckon with another General Election. They believe that by seizing or manufacturing a crisis they can stampede the electorate into one last General Election, a kind of "General Election against General Elections," which will give them mandatory powers in perpetuity. Hence, specifically pacifist organizations, in spite of their propaganda value, may turn out to have a regrettably short-lived utility even in peace-time. Moreover, when war is declared they will not for a moment be tolerated. It is, to say the least of it, doubtful if it is useful to form associations for occasions when they cannot be used. A rotten prop is worse than no prop at all. It may well be that the only use for an organization of objectors, for instance, would be as a cudgel to its members in the hands of the political police.

THE PSYCHOLOGICAL FACTORS MAKING FOR WAR

Apart from parties and organizations aiming, in different ways and with greater or less effectiveness, for peace, there is a school of study as yet in its infancy, the advance of which may lead us further on the road to peace than any movement the world has yet conceived. That study is of the psychological factors buried deep in each of us which cause us to betray our intellects and jettison our morality at the very rumour of war. Why, it is often asked, are instincts of savagery so confidently and successfully called into play by those in authority? Why are noble emotions at the command only of death and destruction? To answer these questions the psychoanalysts probe deep into those basic and mysterious impulses which, unless they are understood, will again and again lead us astray.

It would take too long to attempt an analysis of their methods, and the task has been admirably performed by Dr. Edward Glover in his book, *War, Sadism, and Pacifism*.¹ This much we can say: every step we take towards the understanding of ourselves and the unveiling of our real motives helps us to dispel some of the mists of false doctrine, of mistaken purpose, of illusory ideals with which the subject of war and peace is darkened. If we can know exactly why honourable men will brazenly lie, gentle and tender women exult in maiming and slaughter, captains of industry blindly destroy their own wealth at the threat of war, we not only come every day nearer to the solution of the problem, but we strengthen every day the purpose, clarify the motives,

¹ London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd.

and swell the numbers of those who are strong enough to conquer these impulses.

THE IMMEDIATE TASK

Is there any work which we can do here and now to further peace? If so, what is it? If I may answer the question in a single and that a popular phrase, I should call it the "debunking" of patriotism and of that atmosphere of romance with which war is commonly surrounded in order to conceal its true nature. The martial music, the medals, the religious blessing of banners, the uniforms to catch the eye of the child as well as that of its nurse, the picture of the soldier always as a saviour, not as a destroyer—it is by ruses and disguises such as these that the adult mind is rendered childish, and the horror and pain and frustration and crippling of war are made a schoolboy's holiday.

Swords are, of course, about as useful as bows and arrows; and rifles scarcely more effective than either, if what we are told of contemporary war preparations may be trusted. These facts, which were exposed by the last war, which was nothing short of a scandal from the point of view of romantic traditions, have been quietly suppressed, and are to-day ignored. Side by side with the incongruous realities of war, the romantic tradition of it has persisted in defiance of all reason. Young men are taught to think in terms of emotional appeals that no longer possess the slightest basis in fact; in terms of patriotism, of sword-play, of women and children first, of everything and anything except the realities of modern armaments and intrigues.

CALLING THE BLUFFS

Three drops of "Lewisite," the newest creation of warfare, in contact with the skin are deadly. The experts agree that raiding air-craft carrying chemical bombs are practically invulnerable. The moment war is declared bombs containing "Lewisite" will be on their way to scatter those drops on women and children no less than men.

Cadet Corps and War Films afford examples of the persistence of traditions that were out of date when the Great War began. Mr. Beverley Nichols in *Cry Havoc* tells us that he made a special visit to his old school and found that the boys were not drilled with gas-masks—indeed, that there were no such articles on the premises. They were learning to shoot at targets and hedges, not even at figures, in order that they might be imbued with a falsely attractive view of war.

Another superstition which it is our business, as pacifists, to expose, is the old ignorant pseudo-scientific apologia for war as an integral part of the struggle for existence, Nature's method of securing the survival of the fittest. Warmed up with the hot sauce of bad eugenics, the Fascists are re-serving this hash of misapplied half-knowledge which represents war as being not only inevitable, but indispensable to our species, as having even a positive "regenerative" value without which the human race must perish. Of this false analogy with the life of the Mesozoic swamps, based on a misunderstanding of the Darwinian theory, it is unnecessary to say more than that, even if to be old or cunning enough to escape active service, or to be highly resistant to the

effects of poison gas were heritable variations, they are not therefore variations which most of us value so highly that we desire to secure their predominance at the expense of all the other and more distinctively human characteristics of our species.

THE DISARMAMENT BLUFF

Another, and more specious, bluff that we have to show up is the fake of "disarmament" which is exploited by Governments to-day. Too often the disarmament of Governments has meant that they are prepared to make shift with 999 guns instead of with 1003. The pacifist must not commit himself to working for this kind of disarmament, because it is a mockery which delays peace.

THE PROPER BASIS OF PATRIOTISM

Finally, it is essential that the pacifist should not hug his pacifism to himself as a matter for self-congratulation, for its moral rectitude or its religious purity. No social purpose is served thereby. Pacifism to-day can only be effective if it serves the instinct of self-preservation (and in the concept of "self" I wish to include the mind and its functions, the spirit and its values, the body and its privileges) in the majority of people. Even in the ages of faith the commandment "Thou shalt not kill" went unheeded. Such arguments will not avail in our age.

To lay bare all these sentimentalities and these ruses, this prostitution of human ideals, this distortion of human knowledge, this muddleheadedness and this bunk is my challenge, forlorn though it be, to pacifists in peace-time and in war-time.

It is the *folly* and the *peril*, the *folly* and the *pain*, the *folly* and the inevitable disaster to victor or vanquished that must be our unceasing propaganda.

Years ago I read in the works of a seventeenth-century divine a parable which so struck me that I think I am word-perfect in it to-day. His words shall conclude this chapter.

Two brothers walked abroad one starlit night.

Said A: "Would I had a pasture as large as this firmament."

Said B: "Would I had as many oxen as there be stars."

Said A: "Where wouldst thou feed them?"

Said B: "In thy pasture."

Said A: "What, whether I would or no?"

Said B: "Yes, even in thy despite."

From words to blows till they had sheathed their swords in each other's bowels.

"B" fought his war for "sacred egoism," for new markets, for a place in the sun.

"A" fought his war as a war of self-defence.

CHAPTER V

EDUCATION AND WORLD CITIZENSHIP

by

W. OLAF STAPLEDON

"The Establishment of a universal system of Education, including—

- (a) State provision of adequate facilities for higher education.
- (b) Demilitarization and secularization of existing schools.
- (c) Inclusion in the school curriculum of instruction in—
 - (i) general biology, covering sex education and hygiene;
 - (ii) world economics and finance;
 - (iii) universal as opposed to national history."

The Basis of the Federation of Progressive Societies and Individuals.

CHAPTER V

EDUCATION AND WORLD CITIZENSHIP

I. The Importance of Education

AIMS OF EDUCATION

Education is by far the most important of all services in the modern world community. Even the production of the necessities of life is in a sense subsidiary. A world of human beings educated to be intelligent and responsible world citizens may be trusted to feed and clothe itself; but a badly educated world, such as our own, will inevitably use its industrial and agricultural prowess foolishly. It is bound to fall into economic and military strife; and sooner or later, as its powers increase, it is likely to cut its own throat.

The true aim of education is to turn every boy and girl in the world into a complete individual personality and into a good citizen of the world.

Some hold that only a few should be allowed to develop into anything like complete personality; just as in a hive of bees only a few grubs are allowed to develop full sexuality, the great majority being specialized for work. Society, we are told, cannot accommodate a great number of complete personalities, any more than a hive can accommodate a number of queens. In this view it must inevitably be the lot of most men and women to be merely broken in for some humble function in society, such as mining or factory work. They must not expect to be anything more than efficient and docile servants

of the community. Any irrelevant and high-falutin capacities which they may have must be starved and extirpated.

Formerly this view may have been reasonable enough, but now it is out of date and pernicious. Before the days of mechanical power, society depended almost entirely on human muscles; and so much muscular work had to be done that most individuals in a society could not possibly have either opportunity or desire for education. Moreover, when education of a sort began to spread, Governments found that those who were educated became discontented, critical, and turbulent. They were therefore regarded as bad citizens.

BEARING OF MACHINE-AGE UPON EDUCATION

But in our age machinery is rapidly displacing both unskilled labour and routine skill. In an individualistic economic system this change is a calamity, because it brings unemployment and penury to millions. But it might be a blessing. It affords a unique opportunity of directing human energy upon the more distinctively human activities. In a properly organized world men and women would be employed only in occupations calling for intelligence and devoted interest. Low-grade work they would do only by free choice, for self-discipline. In a properly organized world there would be an immense opportunity for the highly educated, none for the uneducated. Further, it would be the first social duty of every human being to educate himself into vivid awareness of the general pattern and significance of the world's life, physical and mental, so that he might become a full-grown personality and a valuable citizen.

The opponents of the spread of education are of two

very different types. First, there are those who simply do not understand what education really is, and therefore cannot appreciate its value for the individual or for the community. Second, there are those who understand and value true education, but are appalled by the devastating effects of false education in the modern world. George Moore, for instance, declares in his *Confessions of a Young Man* that the spread of education is responsible for the decay of our civilization. It is indeed true that "education," the false education of the modern world, is in some ways more disastrous than no education at all. It is true also, as he says, that our false education is a result of our subservience to machinery. But let us not lose sight of the fact that the goal is a world community truly educated through and through, and that machinery, which has been our undoing, may, and indeed must, henceforth be used in such a manner as to make true education available to every human being who has capacity for it.

EDUCATIONAL UNDER-NOURISHMENT

What is wrong with the world to-day is most emphatically not too much education, but too little, and that little too bad. Man's present position is ironical. He is faced with the supreme opportunity of his career, the opportunity of making a new and splendid world with the aid of science and mechanical power; but he seems unable to use it. What is the cause of this tragic incapacity? It is easy to say merely that human nature is not up to the task. Human nature is, indeed, only half-formed and frail, half-way between ape and true humanity. But when man is properly educated he can already behave

very creditably. The trouble is simply that, through bad education in childhood, youth, and maturity, the great majority of human beings are turned into mental cripples and weaklings. Conflicts bred in infancy confuse their adult lives with unwitting cravings. At school, instead of being enticed to develop their powers and to use their intelligence, they are trimmed into an approved pattern, stuffed with information, taught something of the art of getting on, trained to produce correct responses to the stimuli of patriotism or religion; but they are not taught to think, or shown the true significance of the great human enterprise in which they themselves should be pioneers. Consequently, they grow up to be mentally undeveloped, thwarted, bewildered, greedy for happiness but too misguided to discover it, obscurely resentful, and eager for something to blame and hate.

It is of course true that, even if they had been properly educated in childhood, they would as adults be crippled and embittered by the desperate fight for wages. Educational reform cannot be effective without economic reform. It is useless and dangerous to educate boys and girls to be citizens if, when they go out into the world, they are to live the life of slaves and robots. But, equally, economic reform cannot be really effective without educational reform. For economic individualism and the obsession of material power, though produced by complex historical causes, are perpetuated in each generation by education. And even if the whole world could, like Russia, exchange individualism for communism, that great economic reform would not be enduring without a corresponding educational reform. This the Russians themselves realize. They are educating their young to think

and feel communistically. Whether they are also educating them to think and feel as complete personalities may be doubted. If not, they will be undone by the cult of communal wealth and social obedience as the West has been undone by the cult of private wealth and patriotism.

It would seem, then, that of the two root ills of the world, bad economic organization and bad education, the second, though not so obviously urgent, has, in fact, the more far-reaching effects. The present vogue of educational economy is the most damaging of all our mistakes. Schools, it is enjoined, must be fewer and more over-crowded, classes larger, teachers less well paid and less efficient. No effort is to be made to do more than stamp pupils with the necessary information and the sentiments required for industriousness, docility, and patriotism. Unless this process is reversed, the citizens of the future will be less like citizens even than ourselves.

THE STATUS AND TRAINING OF TEACHERS

The world should be prepared to spend more on the education of future and present citizens than on any other service. The schools and colleges, indeed the whole educational apparatus of a community, should be more a source of pride than its apparatus of industry and agriculture. These produce only commodities for the use of citizens; education produces citizens themselves.

Since education is of all the community's services the most important and the most highly skilled, teaching should be the most honoured of all professions. Its conditions should be such as to attract the most gifted, and not, as they are at present, such as to drive all but

the most devoted into industry, law, or medicine. Care should be taken that the profession actually deserves to be honoured. Only persons of high mental calibre should be allowed to teach, and only those who have also the special ability of the teacher. In order to ensure this ability, those seeking to enter the profession should be subjected to psychological tests.

The training of teachers should be carried out without regard for expense. Apart from technical training, it is essential that the educator should himself be educated in the fullest sense. Above all, he must learn to think critically and not merely to acquire orthodox verbal reactions. Opportunities must be thrust upon him for varied and intense experience. He must make contact with all kinds of society. He must travel. Everything possible must be done to ensure that he shall not develop as a ninny, or as a "mere school teacher."

An adequate system of education demands a great host of young, vital, and well-trained men and women to carry on the main work of evoking personality, organizing sentiments, and imparting information in such a way as to stimulate intelligence. To keep fresh, teachers should have short hours and long holidays. They should make it their business, even after they have finished their training, to maintain contact with the intellectual life of their day. So that they may give their pupils some sense of the reality of other peoples, they should continue to travel. They should have sexual relations. The future citizens should not be formed under the influence of adults who are to a greater or less extent crippled through lack of sexual experience. To-day there are no doubt many in the profession who do work of a high order in

spite of their virginity. But if they had managed to lose their virginity, their work would have been even better. The spinster mentality, female or male, is disastrous in teachers. Headmasters and headmistresses especially should either be married or have temporary sexual relations.

TRANSFER OF ELDERLY TEACHERS TO THE CIVIL SERVICE

As in the air force, so in school teaching, there comes a time of life when the individual, though still capable of other work, is no longer fit for his profession. Only the comparatively young should be allowed to mould young minds by daily contact with them. What, then, is to be done with the great mass of teachers when they reach this fairly low age-limit? This is, indeed, a serious problem, but almost any solution of it is better than the present system of allowing them to continue in the service where they do more harm than good. For nothing is more important than that the young should be preserved from the influence of tired minds. It has been suggested that teachers who have reached the age-limit and are not wanted for higher posts in their profession should be given posts in the Civil Service, where they will still be able to do good work without harming the young. Civil servants, of course, fulfil a very important function in the community, and one which demands a high degree of intelligence and integrity. But their work can be carried on with complete efficiency without those special aptitudes which are essential to teaching and do not as a rule survive far into middle age.

In the case of university work, a teacher may continue to have a vitalizing effect long after he would have ceased

to be useful in a school. But here also the problem occurs, though in a less acute form.

AUTONOMY FOR TEACHERS SUBJECT TO WORLD CONTROL

In a properly organized world community the control of education in all parts of the world would lie with the organized teaching profession of the world, subject to the final authority of the supreme world government. Meanwhile, in the national state the national profession of teachers should have the main control over the educational system. It is necessary to give the teaching profession as much autonomy as possible, since educators alone can appreciate the importance and the difficulties of education. Since local authorities are bound to be on the whole less intelligent and far-seeing than a central government, the educational system should be as free as possible from interference by local bodies. It is, of course, good that localities should control their own affairs; but this supremely important social service must not be allowed to depend on the good will of urban district councillors or even of city councillors. National control, no doubt, might be admitted to some extent even in the ideal world, since each people should have its special cultural characteristics. But even in the present world of national sovereign States, some kind of world control would be advisable, and is, indeed, very urgent in order to put an end to the inculcation of patriotism and distorted history. History text-books should be very strictly supervised by international authority, so as to eliminate nationalistic bias and glorification of war. Where the historians of different nations are in disagreement, all the different accounts should be given.

EXTIRPATION OF MILITARIZING INFLUENCES

At present education is influenced, much more than most people admit, by long-established military tradition. We are so accustomed to the glorification of our own country's military prowess and of military virtues in general that many of us become incapable of recognizing the bias in that direction. Many, for instance, are outraged by any suggestion that the Officers' Training Corps has a militaristic influence on the minds of the young. It does not occur to them that any occupation which involves the idea of a national enemy must dispose boys to look for national enemies in the actual world, even though they may deprecate war. Similarly with the Boy Scout Movement, however pacific its promoters may be, what appeals to its juvenile members is its "Red Indian" spirit.

No doubt young human animals are bound to go through a phase of mimicking in play the aggressive behaviour appropriate to pre-human and early human ages. To repress this tendency would be a mistake. But to encourage it and sanctify it by making it appear not the atavism which it is, but one of the most honourable activities of civilized man, is disastrous.

Military pageantry has a definite influence in modern life. In State ceremonies the Army and Navy usually play a dominant part. This is defended on the score of traditional symbolism. Those who are anxious to retain that symbolism cannot recognize that they are seeking to preserve in the modern world a mental attitude which is archaic and dangerous. The effect which military pageantry produces on the average person is still much

the same as that which her soldiers' red coat produced on the Victorian nursemaid.

To the incidental militarism of public ceremony must be added the influence of great military pageants such as the Aldershot Tattoo and the Hendon Air Display. To assert that these magnificent exhibitions of military skill and efficiency do not dispose the young, and indeed adults also, to desire actual warfare is naïve. I do not suggest that all displays of aerial skill must necessarily be bad. Stunts and formation flights can quite well be dissociated from warfare. I suggest merely that all pageants which glorify war must incline the young to militarism.

There is another aspect of the influence of military tradition in education, and one which is perhaps more serious in the long run, even than the glorification of violence. The military moral code is epitomized by the quotation "Theirs not to reason why." From the point of view of those in authority, whether generals, school-masters, clerics, industrial magnates, or statesmen, obedience is indeed the supreme virtue for the rank and file. And there is, of course, a kind of obedience which is very desirable. But the kind of obedience which is inculcated by the military tradition is not a virtue in responsible citizens of the world. The Army, like the Roman Church, commands the individual to surrender his private judgment and conscience into the hands of authority, so that, instead of painfully facing the novel problems of conduct which continually arise in our ever-changing world, he accepts some traditional solution which is in fact completely inappropriate.

AND OF CLERICAL

The influence of the Churches on education is disastrous both in this and in other respects. One may recognize that long ago the Church was the great educational force, and yet also see quite clearly that it has now ceased to be anything of the sort. To-day men no longer look to clerics for enlightenment, still less for inspiration. Yet clerical influence, direct or indirect, still plays a great part in our educational organizations. Of the system of "prayers" and "scripture" which still obtains in most schools, the best that can be said is that it may give the rising generation some knowledge of one great source of our culture. But the teaching of Scripture is, as a matter of fact, by now so perfunctory and insincere that it defeats its own end. Not only does it make the Bible boring, but also it tends to choke any capacity for genuine religious experience. The need for genuine religious experience is, perhaps, the supreme need of our age. One of the main factors preventing a great religious movement from emerging out of modern thought and feeling is the dead hand of the old religion laid upon the young in schools and homes.

The Established Church receives financial support from the State, and therefore from the taxpayers, whether they approve or disapprove. Funds thus procured are used partly for the maintenance of the Church's own schools, and therefore for education with a clerical bias; and since in our day orthodox religion is definitely reactionary, and opposed to the moral and social changes which are so greatly needed, the upshot is that a large number of children are launched upon life un-

suitably equipped for world citizenship. It is extremely urgent, then, that education should be completely freed from the control of religious bodies, of whatever kind.

CONTROL OF PARENTS

Since education begins in infancy, the teaching profession of the world should have some control even over the upbringing of children by their parents. At present most children are more or less warped by early home influences, either by strained relations between parents, or by unwise treatment. Some are spoiled, some unduly repressed. Many, torn between love and hate for one parent or both, develop deep-seated conflicts of desire. The result is that most children grow up with unsuspected mental kinks, prejudices, and phobias, which make it impossible for them ever to become satisfactory citizens. In an intelligent world state no one would be allowed to become a father or mother without a licence for parenthood, and an additional licence would be required to enable parents to bring up their own infants. Children of parents who failed to obtain the second licence would be sent to infant schools.

II. Principles of Education

DOUBLE FUNCTION OF EDUCATION

So much for the control of the educational system. What of the principles of education itself? Whether in home or school or college, education has two aims which come more into conflict as age advances. The young

have to be equipped for some special work in the community; they have also to be turned into complete personalities and valuable citizens. The first is merely vocational training; the second true education. Both vocational training and true education are necessary; but in our day true education is overwhelmingly the more urgent because it is the more neglected, and because the lack of it is ruining our world. The teaching profession of the world should insist that true education is never sacrificed to vocational training.

The aim of true education—to turn the young human being into a complete personality and a valuable citizen of the world—may be described as follows. Education seeks to organize or harmonize the impulses in relation to one another so that the individual shall not be torn in two by conflicting desires. It seeks also to evoke in him the will to use all his capacities to the full in the service of the world community or for the advancement of the human spirit. He must be given full bodily health and opportunity for delight in skilled muscular activity of some kind or other. Athletics, in fact, must not be neglected, nor must dancing. The individual must be trained in precise and zestful sense-perception, and in “sensibility,” the appreciation of human character and behaviour.

DEVELOPMENT OF CRITICAL INTELLIGENCE

He must be taught to think accurately, and to regard all information critically. If possible, he must be given a passion for pioneering in thought, even for piratical adventures against the sanctified beliefs of his teachers. Above all he must be taught to be relentlessly critical

of his own motives, and at the same time imaginatively sympathetic toward the motives of others, and towards their beliefs and processes of reasoning. In general, he must learn to be both receptive and cautious, both imaginative and sceptical, and at the same time both sensitive and self-reliant. He must also have opportunity for exercising whatever degree of creative imagination he may possess, either in mechanical invention or skilled handicraft or pure art. Any special aptitude which he may have must be discovered and turned to good account by his teachers.

He must, of course, absorb large quantities of information about himself and the world. He should be made to feel that the main purpose of this toil is not merely to put him through examinations, not to help him to get on in the world, but to fit him to play his part in the age-long adventure of humanity. To do this, he must work out for himself by intuition and intellectual analysis the relative importance of his various values; that is, of the ends which he proposes to pursue. And he must gain whatever insight he can into the nature and aims of the awakened human mind, and into the course which the human adventure has so far taken. In fact, to use psychological language, he must organize his sentiments, subordinating all lesser sentiments to the supreme sentiment of loyalty to the enterprise of the human species. And this enterprise he must regard not merely as a quest for material power, but as a struggle toward ever more awakened mentality. All his values, private and public, he should prize both for their own sakes and as minute factors in the realization of the supreme human goal.

RELATION OF PUPILS TO TEACHERS

If his education is to proceed rightly, he must have the right kind of relation with his teachers. He must not be spoon-fed, but must be made to feel that he is educating himself, though with his teachers' aid and stimulus. He must regard his teachers not as infallible authorities, but as beings like himself, open to criticism, though on the whole more experienced and capable. Discipline should be in essence self-discipline, and discipline by the respected public opinion of his fellows, not discipline by an imposed authority regarded as alien. This kind of education, in which the teacher aims at inducing the pupils to educate themselves and to govern themselves, calls for much greater teaching skill than spoon-feeding and compulsion. It also involves a much larger proportion of teachers to pupils.

This is not the place to discuss in detail the application of these general principles, but a few extremely important points must be mentioned.

*III. Some Applications***EDUCATION FOR USE OF LEISURE**

The most important application of the above principles in our age is that leisure should be regarded not as a waste of time or as a positive danger, as it is in most schools to-day, but as one of the chief items in the curriculum. Unless civilization is to suffer shipwreck, leisure must play a much greater part in the lives of men and women than formerly. It is, therefore, extremely urgent that they should be able to make good use of it.

To-day the aim seems to be to ensure that schoolchildren shall not have a moment to themselves, lest they should be up to some mischief. When they are not working in class, they must either be struggling with "home work" or taking part in organized games. Seldom have they free choice of action and the consequent sense of being responsible for their conduct. As a result, any free time which they do secure is apt to be frittered away in lazing, ragging, or sabotage. The over-worked young human being inevitably uses his leisure solely for relaxation; the repressed and the barrenly educated solely for "letting off steam." But the properly educated boy or girl will spontaneously develop many strong interests, and will work at them during leisure with heroic zest and concentration. In such a case the enterprises of leisure may well become the most educative influence in the child's life. Their importance lies in their spontaneity. The child himself should choose his activity (at times, no doubt, through the indirect suggestion of an adult) and carry it out according to his own plan. Thus he will learn a far greater self-respect and self-reliance than is produced in class-work or organized games. He will come to feel in his bones that the proper occupation of a free man is not "work," dictated by a superior authority, but spontaneous self-expression. But he may also discover that self-expression is most satisfying when it takes a line serviceable to the community.

EDUCATION IN ART AND PHILOSOPHY

As I see it, the two starting-points of a sound curriculum are biology and art. Aesthetic experience is

needed not only because it is in itself one of the most awakening experiences, but also as an antidote to scientific experience.

No doubt the true intellectual corrective to the more blinkered and dogmatic kind of science is philosophy, which should criticize and relate all the data of experience, including those of science and art. But even apart from explicit philosophical criticism, aesthetic experience itself, if it is at all vivid, disposes the mind to suspect the more extravagant claims of science. In our day, though many reactionary influences are indeed still opposed to science, the scientific point of view is becoming increasingly popular. Consequently much superficial and truly barbarous thinking is now done in the name of science. The most effective antidote to this is, I believe, aesthetic experience. Moreover, aesthetic experience in the sphere of art may lead up to an aesthetic ecstasy in relation to the universe. And this, I should say, is the only genuine religion.

IN BIOLOGY

Biology should be the starting-point and, during school years, the guiding thread of all theoretical study. The young child should begin by interesting himself in the working of his own body and in the behaviour of other living things. In early school days biology, practical and theoretical, should be his main subject. It should, of course, include a study of personal hygiene and all the aspects of sex. It should also open the way on the one hand to chemistry, physics, mathematics, logic, and astronomy, and on the other to psychology, ethics, sociology, foreign languages, and history. Interest in

chemistry and physics should arise from the need to understand the processes of the human body and the bearing of the physical environment upon human activities. Mathematics and logic should, I believe, be approached from the same angle. Astronomy should be regarded as the study of the more remote environment to which the human species has to adjust itself. Psychology is obviously a biological science. Ethics, though it must certainly not be *derived* from psychology or biology, should be related to biology through the concept of the need of the organism to fulfil its capacities. Sociology, foreign languages, and history are studies of the distinctive activities of the human species. Stated thus, the programme sounds rather terrifying. But these dry-as-dust names should be taken to imply subjects which, presented in a vital manner, can be entralling to the growing mind. All the various subjects of study should be related to each other wherever possible, and at all stages philosophical questions should be raised.

Theoretical study should connect itself with aesthetic experience. Biology should lead to aesthetic or quasi-aesthetic appreciation of form and function in living things. Mathematics should give delight in the unity, comprehensiveness, and economy of mathematical principles and devices. Chemistry, physics, and especially astronomy, should give the same kind of satisfaction. The second, humane line of study, which includes history, should connect with the human side of aesthetic experience, and should lead to a deep sense of the drama of mankind's career.

The child's artistic capacity should be evoked both by handicrafts, in which he can strive for a severely

functional beauty, and also by music, acting, story-telling, and "making pictures."

TREATMENT OF LITERATURE

Literature should be one of the most important subjects. It is also one of the most difficult to handle, and may do far more harm than good. There is great danger of creating insincere veneration for a body of "classical" texts which have no vital significance to the student. The study of literature should have several distinct functions in education. It should make for accuracy and penetration of thought, and delicacy of emotional reaction. It should also be a means of learning accuracy and economy of expression. These various ends should be achieved both by composition and by criticism of actual texts, ranging from the worst type of local journalism to the finest contemporary and past writing. Literature should also be used to deepen insight into human character and into all the subtler aspects of experience. Above all, by means of it the youth of the world should be saved from taking science too seriously, a habit which is as disastrous as taking it not seriously enough.

HOW EDUCATION COULD SAVE THE WORLD

If we could reform education along these lines, and at the same time reform economic organization, we might in a few years produce a world such as has never before existed save in the dreams of philosophers. But there is at present little will for educational reform. In times of economic distress education tends to be regarded by politicians and by the mass of badly educated parents as a mere extravagance. By some it is still considered

as actually harmful to young people who are destined to a life of drudgery. In an age of reaction such as ours, when one of the most highly educated nations is burning books and stamping out all independent thought, there seems little hope of a widespread demand for true education.

Yet education alone can save the world. How great the need, then, for those who recognize the importance of true education to make a great concerted effort to create a new movement of opinion in its favour! Mighty forces are against them. The politicians, the militarists, the Churches, the industrial magnates, the commercial Press, the disillusioned masses, all these are at heart against them, though for very different reasons. And when it comes to the point of deciding what true education really means, the forces of the extreme left will probably be against them too. For the extreme left sees little further than the need for economic communism.

BEARING UPON THE COMMUNIST POSITION—ECONOMIC CHANGES ONLY A MEANS

Now economic communism is, I believe, essential. But it is essential as a necessary means to the social end, not as the end itself. In the eyes of those who have suffered bitterly under the present economic system, and also in the eyes of those who have the gift of vivid sympathy with the oppressed, the essential means, permanently withheld, is liable to appear as the true end; and those who insist that economic change alone is not enough are apt to seem disloyal to the cause of revolution. The supporters of the extreme left are, as a rule, ready to agree that a revolution in education is necessary,

but what they desire is to make education subservient to the doctrines of official communism, even as at present it is largely subservient to capitalism. They are therefore in conflict with those who refuse to subordinate education to any social doctrine whatever, save the doctrine that the aim of society should be to develop, so far as possible, the mental capacities of all its members, by inducing them to seek the truth dispassionately and to give due weight to all desires.

A WORLD OF MENTAL CRIPPLES

To-day it is more than ever needful to keep this end in view, for not only is it the supreme goal but also the most important means to world unity and well-being. Even though great social changes do indeed demand resolute conduct, and even though resolution is sometimes more important than breadth of outlook, yet to-day what is wrong with the world is not lack of resolution, but lack of imaginative insight into points of view different from one's own. It is clear, for instance, that communism and fascism cannot both be right; yet both are passionately held and heroically defended. It is clear that there is some truth in the claims of rival nations. What is needed is not more resolute loyalty to class or party or nation, but more of the disposition to see other men's points of view. These various group-feuds can only be overcome by the spread of true education, education of the kind which used to be called "liberal," but without the upper-class bias of so-called liberal education. Its aim should be the full and free development of body and mind. At present the great majority of human beings are mental cripples whose judgment and will have been

distorted by hostile influences in their environment, and especially by bad economic conditions and by faulty education. This is true, in different manners, equally of the extreme left and the extreme right and the undistinguished centre. The pioneers of true social reconstruction must, therefore, expect opposition from all sides, especially on the subject of education.

TASK FOR EDUCATIONALISTS

But at all costs education must be saved, and not only saved but reorganized on a much more generous plan. Those who realize this have a grim task before them. They have to snatch power whenever they can, so as to control educational policy; but still more important, they have to convert the peoples. They have to use every art of propaganda and reasonable persuasion to make all men see that the modern world cannot find peace or prosperity, still less true happiness, till all its citizens are educated, in such a way as to call out their full capacity for citizenship and personality.

CHAPTER VI

REFORM OF THE SEX LAWS

by
JANET CHANCE

“Sexual Questions.

The release of personal conduct from all taboos and restrictions except those imposed in the interest of the weak and the young.

(a) Legislation to secure—

- (i) reform of the divorce laws;
- (ii) legalization of abortion, with proper safeguards;
- (iii) abolition of the laws penalizing abnormality;
- (iv) provision of facilities for voluntary sterilization.

(b) Adequate provision of information on and facilities for birth control.”

The Basis of the Federation of Progressive Societies and Individuals.

CHAPTER VI

REFORM OF THE SEX LAWS

REASON AS THE BASIS OF LEGISLATION

The Federation of Progressive Societies and Individuals claims that the main objects of social and economic reconstruction should be such as commend themselves to reason, and it asserts that there is urgent need at the present time for cohesion and co-operation amongst those who support that claim.

Such a claim is in one sense an astonishing one, astonishing not in its content but in its necessity. And in no sphere is the necessity of an appeal for a reasonable solution of public questions at once more obvious and more astonishing than in the sphere of sexual matters. In economics, politics, and education it is not, perhaps, so strange that in the year 1934 we should still have to support the communal effort to be reasonable, for in those spheres (as a glance at the Federation policy will show) rational reconstruction implies not only the removal of old and unreasonable obstructions, but also the discovery, planning, and investigation of new types of action, and in that sense the effort to be reasonable must, it is to be supposed, last as long as human life itself. But in the sexual sphere the communal effort to be reasonable has at present a very much more limited scope; it is confined almost entirely to the negative task of removing tyrannical coercions and destructive restrictions for which there is no possible justification except guesswork, illusion, or superstition.

CASE FOR FREEDOM

Sexual life on its positive side is a very personal matter, guided by taste and temperament, an affair of desire and artistry for which there are and can be few common rules. The fact that it is necessary to plead for regulation of sexual life merely to allow freedom of development in this essentially individual sphere shows in a marked degree the astonishing unreasonableness of the legacy of oppressive laws and customs left us by our fore-bears.

It is claimed by the Federation that personal conduct should be released "from all taboos and restrictions except those imposed in the interest of the weak and the young," a perfectly reasonable proposal, one must agree, unless one is the victim of the belief that sexual morality should conform to an absolute standard which has at some past period been settled for all time and all space, or is at present being settled by some incorporeal being. Such beliefs are, of course, quite common (see for example the primer of the Oxford Group Movement, of which 170,000 copies have been sold); but for those who have not succumbed to that superstition, it is plain that there is constant need for a human revision of codes and customs, and that prohibitions must be justified by some communal end before they are imposed on any individual. This fundamental definition and assertion of individual liberty bring us at once to three points of conflict with the present state of the law.

These arise in connection with divorce, abortion, and so-called "unnatural vice."

SUPERSTITION ABOUT DIVORCE

Our divorce laws are a grotesque example of unreasonable interference with private life. We permit our laws to make havoc of our domestic intimacies in deference to dogmas we no longer respect, in a way which would at once be seen to be fantastic, were it applied to some other sphere which has hitherto been immune. For what is the position in the sphere of sex? A small body of men (a minority even on a Royal Commission) are permitted to say that they have supernatural authority for the dogma that two unhappy partners must remain yoked together, whereas if one only is unhappy, that one may be freed of his or her bondage; they are, moreover, permitted to enforce this dogma by law. If the same absurdity were permitted in the railway system, a small minority would announce that it is supernaturally desired that our trains should run during the hours of darkness only, and we should be legally compelled to travel to business at midnight and remain at work till dawn, merely because a superstitiously inclined Railway Directorate so decreed. One has only to read the parliamentary and other speeches of the opponents of rational divorce reform to realize that, whatever else these persons demonstrate, they clearly demonstrate the prevalence of superstition amongst the governing classes.

In his recently published book, *Marriage, Children, and God*,¹ Mr. Claud Mullins has made a most useful collection of the opinions held by religious bodies on various sex questions, opinions from which for the most part he himself strongly dissents. Some of these are

¹ London: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd.

frankly unbelievable in their crude and brutal subjection of the physical and mental welfare of one partner to the supposed spiritual welfare of one or both. His book should be studied by anyone anxious to understand the roots of the opposition to humane reform. It is incidentally one of the most hideous of present-day indictments of Christianity, and it proves conclusively that in sexual morals Hitler has plenty of spiritual kinsmen in the higher ranks of our clergy. Mr. Mullins's statements on divorce deserve special attention, coming as they do from one who has a wide, personal knowledge of Christian theory and practice, and who himself accepts Christian morality in its broad outlines. On page 56 he speaks of the "view of divorce held to-day by *most professing Christians* [italics inserted], a view which our law enforces with very harmful results to public morality, namely, that one act of adultery suffices to break the marriage bond, but that years of brutal or selfish conduct do not." And he adds: "The Christian Churches should be clamouring for the reform of our marriage and divorce laws and taking the lead in a protest against the existing position." Mr. Mullins's advice to the Churches is surely both wise and diplomatic. It would undoubtedly be startling and refreshing if our Archbishops suddenly braved the wrath of their own Mothers' Unions and Diocesan Councils and came out boldly for the "spiritual and moral sides of marriage," which, Lord Buckmaster urged in speaking on divorce, are "incomparably more important than the physical side." Surely God and the Churches would gain a new respect and a fresh lease of life if they had the courage *now* to lead a movement to which no doubt they will have to yield eventually,

exactly as they have after long resistance yielded to the birth-control movement. But perhaps the Archbishops know their own God and their own rank and file better even than Mr. Mullins. Perhaps it is only too lamentably true that both God and "most professing Christians" do hold views "harmful to public morality," and that the Church would lose heavily both in this world and the next if it acted in accordance with human decency.

SAVAGERY OF ABORTION LAWS

The abortion laws bring us to a more savage example of the dead hand of the past. The right to the control of conception is nowadays generally admitted. The opposition here is plainly fighting a losing battle. And the demand for the legalization of abortion is the logical, reasonable, and wise corollary to that admitted right. Birth control is at present insecure and incomplete, and, in the absence of any sound reason to the contrary, abortion is its complement and will remain so until further research has made birth control a secure, sufficient, and, it is to be hoped, unobtrusive method of controlling parenthood. Again, if we wish to get a clear view of the rational attitude to the legalization of abortion, it is helpful to probe the statements of those who oppose it. These will rarely be found reasonable, medical, or scientific. They will be found to be religious.

Here Mr. Mullins's book provides us once more with most useful material. He tells us that "so far none of the Churches has fully considered the problem; they have assumed that all abortion is as immoral as at present it is illegal." And he quotes from the Report of the Lambeth Conference, 1930, the following words: "The

Conference further records its abhorrence of the sinful practice of abortion." This quotation sounds the keynote of all superstitious condemnations of sexual morals by its use of the word "sinful." We are perhaps apt to forget, those of us who no longer frequent Church circles, how deeply rooted in this country and how recently vigorous in our whole upbringing has been this sense of sin. And Mr. Mullins's book is a most salutary reminder that this superstitious attitude to human conduct, this dogmatic and irrational labelling of one act as "righteous" and another as "sinful" is still disastrously alive amongst the very people to whom we allow considerable influence in our education and our law-making.

CHRISTIANS ON SEX

An hour spent with Mr. Mullins in his courageous criticism of much Christian morality is like an hour spent in a mediaeval torture chamber. To a person accustomed to rational and humane standards of conduct, the phrases he quotes and the opinions he brings together sound at first fantastically unreal and mercifully remote from present-day life . . . until one discovers their authors. These opinions, these crude ruthless gradings of "sins," this autocratic branding of other men's sexual morals as immoral, this preference (surely a masterpiece this), this preference for the death of a wife in childbirth to the sinful use of a contraceptive, these are not the discredited dicta of some voice from the Dark Ages. No. They are the considered judgments, the ripe wisdom of the Right Reverend Monsignor Brown, of the Lambeth Conference of 1908, of the White Cross League, of Mr. A. J. Anderson (author of *Christian Marriages and*

the Limitation of the Family), of Dr. R. de Guchteneere, of the Bishop of Southwark, and of Canon Lyttelton.

And these Christians ask us also to believe that they are the confidants and spokesmen of an all-loving and all-knowing Father. It would be better tactics, one would have thought, to shoulder the blame themselves.

SEXUAL ABNORMALITY—REFUSAL TO BLAME

There are very few people, religious, lay, or medical, who are in a position to make definite judgments on the nature or the value of sexual abnormalities. Most of us are so steeped in prejudice on this question that we have not begun to consider it objectively; while those who are themselves of unusual type are often biassed by the difficulties of their position. All the more reason, therefore, the reasonable man would say, to withdraw judicial definitions and legal penalties out of so ill-defined and intimate a sphere. Especially, he would add, where two adults are concerned. We allow adults, and rightly, to plunge into the most disastrous matrimonial entanglements on their own responsibility. The Church and State even rivet these entanglements upon them. It hardly seems, therefore, that we can leave it to the law to pronounce in the difficult cases of sexual abnormality what degree, if any, of criminality is involved, still less what degree, if any, of punishment it merits. Where a child or a feble-minded person may be harmfully used, then the law, it is agreed by all, should provide protection.

BIRTH-CONTROL INFORMATION AND FACILITIES

Another item of the Federation policy on sexual questions is the "adequate provision of information on

and facilities for birth control." Though birth control is won in principle, a great deal yet remains to be done in practice. Out of all the local authorities in England and Wales, only sixty-two have so far taken any action under Mem. 153, which gives Maternity and Child Welfare Committees permission to include birth-control advice in their services. Of these, nineteen have established special clinics; six have set up gynecological clinics at which birth-control advice is given; eight allow the reference of cases to voluntary clinics or private doctors, and pay a fee for these; twelve have authorized their medical officers to give advice; twelve have decided to give the advice but have not yet acted in the matter; and five have lent or hired their premises to a local branch of the National Birth Control Association for use as a voluntary birth-control clinic.

NEED FOR SEX EDUCATION

There remains, perhaps, the most important of all the aims of the Federation in sexual matters—the advocacy of a sound sex education. Here again the primary need is not for any new scheme of study or programme of action by teachers and parents; what is needed is that sex questions should be freed from the nonsensical atmosphere in which they are at present submerged in the majority of homes and schools. Were that done, common sense would come into its own, and parents and teachers would quite naturally adopt modes of training and instruction which at present often demand a high degree of individuality and courage. And if, indeed, there still remained serious problems in the sexual education of our children, then such freedom

would have supplied the scope for experiment and investigation on which alone sound judgments could be based. Short of that, however, there is at present a vast amount of sensible opinion and reliable capacity in the sphere of sex education which only awaits recognition and support to become effective. It is the aim of the Federation to focus the rational opinion of the community wherever it is to be found and to bring it to the support of those parents and teachers who are at present handicapped or penalized by the well-organized forces of reaction.

It is difficult for those who have shaken off all association of sin with sex to realize how closely entangled are those two ideas still, and how ludicrously and tragically that association still influences the lives of the majority of men, women, and children in this country. But the merest enquiry into and the briefest contact with any sexual difficulty in any section of the community (with the exception of a small circle of fortunate or emancipated people) is sufficient to prove its existence. The truth is that the ideas on sex matters expressed by the average run of Church workers, medical men on public platforms, teachers in their official capacity, politicians, journalists, ministers of religion, and the conventionally minded in general, are often so fantastic that they are not given the serious and constant refutation which they merit.

A SEX CONFERENCE ORGANIZED BY THE F.P.S.I.

It was in order to test, in a small way, the level of opinion in relation to sex education that the Federation held, in July 1933, a conference at which actual experiments in sex education could be described and discussed.

The work of preparing this conference gave opportunity for much interesting and some astounding revelations of opinion on this subject. One headmistress when asked to co-operate stated that the matter was being dealt with in her school; that each girl at about the age of twelve had five minutes' talk with her form mistress or with the Head; and that an outside lecturer came once a year and spoke on some aspect of sex hygiene. More than one mistress indicated that *her* girls had no sex difficulties, and more than one considered many of those who discuss sex education "abnormal" or "freakish." Some critics expressed surprise that nowadays there was any need whatsoever for sex education, there being in their opinion too much open discussion of such matters already.

IMPORTANCE OF SEX KNOWLEDGE

Such opinions demonstrate plainly the degraded conception of education which is current when education touches sex. No one of these persons would consider five minutes and a yearly lecture sufficient for personal health, for algebra, or for carpentry, and no one of them would dare to say that his or her children had no health difficulties or no mathematical inadequacy on such slender evidence. And yet sexual well-being rivals in importance even physical well-being, and has a more direct effect upon the individual's happiness than the degree of his mathematical capacity. Indeed, if there is any one subject which stands out far ahead of all others in fundamental urgency in the lives of young boys and girls about to leave school, it is surely in a large number of cases not gymnastic prowess, not literary excellence,

not even proficiency in the three Rs, but a sound knowledge of the facts of sex life, and an ability to apply his knowledge to the particular problems that arise for decision. It is even easier later in life to rectify errors in digestive hygiene or in some other important physical function than to rectify some of the fundamental errors made early in life through sexual ignorance. How much more important, for example, is it to a working-class girl to understand fully and to have discussed wisely with some experienced adult the consequences of the sex act in marriage (let alone outside marriage) than even to be able to read and write correctly.

Such a girl seals her fate by her ignorance. Instead of remaining to some extent mistress of her fortunes, by a sensible use of birth-control knowledge, she marries, and becomes a mother, once, twice, four, six, or eight times in sheer muddled acquiescence, until it is too late to recover any control of her health, her finances, or her home happiness, and she joins, to the benefit of no one, the great army of exhausted, semi-conscious, victims of motherhood.

This is the denial of all vigorous, independent life; it is an ignoble and worthless wastage of the potentialities which lie hidden in every human being. And it is the direct result of faulty education. No girl need become the slack-bodied, weary-minded drudge to which excessive motherhood quickly degrades her to-day. No girl wishes to lose her youth so soon. But the gap in education between her real needs and the syllabus chosen for her by the old gentlemen we dub "Church and State" is so wide that she is sent from school into the world as ignorant, or much more ignorant than many a savage, of those

things which are to make or mar all life for her thereafter.

Nor, of course, does home education at present fill this gap. The eagerness of the average parent to lay this responsibility on the teachers, and the censure so often aroused by the teachers' efforts to meet this need, are sufficient testimony to the parents' inadequacy in this region.

THE OPPOSITION OF THE CHURCH

These, then, are the points on which the Federation seeks to unite progressive opinion. It is surely justified in claiming that there is a vast mass of support for these proposals, which does not yet declare itself in any united action, although it clearly declares itself in practice by the unofficial contempt with which it treats our obsolete sex laws. It is surely not over-optimistic to believe that, if this unspoken support can be given expression, and if all those who are in favour of these reforms can be federated and their agreement expressed when these issues come before Parliament and elsewhere, the body of opinion mobilized might prove (even within the present system) more than a match for the forces of reaction.

When we turn to plans for action and ask what exactly are these forces of reaction which must be met and defeated, it is not difficult to put one's finger on the centre and mainspring of the opposition. No one who has worked through the years that preceded the present partial victory of birth-control reform has any doubt on that score. Other influences may have had their share, economic considerations may have been present in the minds of some opponents, vested interests in cheap labour and

plentiful cannon-fodder may have lent their weight, but the main, organized, open vocal opposition always came and still comes from religion. In public meetings, on health committees, in Parliament, behind the scenes in administration, it was not the employer of labour nor the munition firm that deplored the extension of a particular piece of medical knowledge to the working classes; it was always the clergyman, the Church worker, the member of the Mothers' Union, the religiously minded head of a college or a public school, or a doctor speaking not from a consulting-room but from a Roman Catholic pulpit. And in the contest over abortion and divorce exactly the same has been true. Mr. Mullins's book, from which we have quoted, gives ample proof of this, and is to be welcomed not only for its diagnosis of this main centre of opposition, but also as a sign that even within the circle of professing Christians the opposition is weakening.

CHURCH PEOPLE NOT SEXUALLY ABOVE REPROACH

Now churchmen and women are human; they are sensitive, as we all are, to public ridicule and public contempt; and large numbers of them are not sufficiently assured of the divine origin of their opinions to stand up indefinitely to human opinion. Many of them find it difficult enough to live their own sexual lives without recourse to the very common sense which they publicly condemn. And quite frankly, it would have been wiser had some of them refrained from putting themselves on record, so plainly do their writings reveal that all is far from sexually well with them and their marriages. Very gradually in the case of birth control their opposition

was undermined, and gradually public opinion was made unmistakably vocal and effective, and the politician found it wiser to bow to the latter and brave the wrath of the religious few.

THE NEED TO FOCUS OPINION

It is therefore plainly our task to unite, encourage, and focus opinion on these issues. If it is against us, we shall fail; if it is with us, we may expect the same gradual humanizing process to succeed, superstition to be discredited, and common sense to decide the various questions which still remain to be settled in any change in divorce or abortion legislation. And in practice, it will be found that the same audiences (for example those of the working-class women's organizations) which welcomed birth-control reform are to-day welcoming the promise of a saner abortion law, and that progressive bodies, in so far as they are in touch with the realities of amateur abortion, are fully aware of the urgency of the need for this change. In one respect abortion is already ahead of birth control. It has received at a much earlier stage in its career the serious attention of the medical profession, and from Lord Dawson's words we may judge that only one thing prevents that profession from expressing itself more precisely on the issue, and that is the hesitance of the general public to give it a lead—a lead for which, be it noted, it does not wait when tuberculosis is under discussion, or drainage, or bacteriology. Let the Federation, then, help to give the B.M.A. the lead it awaits, by giving the women of the country a platform from which they and their spokesmen may make clear to the doctors, the priests, and the politicians that this is a

desperate need, unseen and unheard only because the penalties for personal speech and personal action are so severe and vindictive.

SEX ISSUES NOT ISOLATED

There is a further implication in the call of the Federation for united action by rationally minded people. It is that of an essential unity of philosophy which will lead to a unity of purpose and action over a wide range of questions. Such a call to common action brings those of us who already subscribe to perhaps one or two of the items of the tentative, original programme of the Federation to ask ourselves on what grounds we so subscribe, and whether those grounds are not also a reason for giving our support to other items or even to the whole of that programme, and to the work of correction and addition which it no doubt still requires. It asks in fact whether there is a common basis for "progressive" thought, and challenges us to go beyond the particular reform for which perhaps we have worked hitherto somewhat exclusively and examine our attitude to those other reforms which are advocated for exactly the same basic reasons as our own "pet" subject.

The dependence of sex reforms on the wider questions of economic and political issues is clearly demonstrated by a consideration of the manner in which our present laws and customs have arisen. If further object lessons are needed, we have only to look at the state of sexual life in Germany and in Russia to-day. We see Germany "putting the clock back" politically and economically, and we see also harsh autocratic regulations cropping up, based on or justified by fetish-worship; regulations

for the sterilization of some section of the community, for the prohibition of marriage here and the encouragement of procreation there, the banning of all free enquiry into sexual life and free dissemination of birth-control knowledge, the reinstatement of the old woman-wife-breeder type, the crushing of the new woman-individual-worker type, and finally the solemn decreeing of which cosmetics are and which are not lawful. And on the other hand we see Russia experimenting in a new political and economic régime which brings with it as an accepted part of the whole practically all those reforms for which reformers are likely to find themselves working here for many years to come in this country.

It is here that we strike a fundamental issue which is disturbing the minds and redirecting the actions of very many people. What is in fact the relation between such subsidiary reforms as the Federation has placed on its programme (reform of education, of sexual laws, of the legal system, of town and country planning, etc.) to the primary programme which it has also adopted, that of world-reorganization? Are the former ultimately inevitably bound up with the latter? And is it profitable or is it futile to work for the lesser whatever the fate of the greater?

HOW FAR MUST THE ECONOMIC BACKGROUND BE CHANGED?

It is obvious, of course, that advance can be made within the present national economic systems; gains have been so made already. But the examples of Italy and Germany make us pause before even here we reckon our gains secure against some new form of social reaction. Is it possible that here too we might, given a swing over to Fascism, or a further swerve to National Conservatism,

lose what we have gained, and relapse into the vexatious restrictions of Victorian prudery and worse, into the sex persecutions which strong forces in the Churches are only too obviously anxious to enforce?

And again, what is the relation of the Socialist and Communist theory to what the Federation claims are advanced and beneficial sex morals? In practice we see in Russia that sex morality has made immense strides, and that in the new economic setting, society is finding a new *modus vivendi*, not dissimilar, broadly speaking, to that outlined and adopted by the Federation. But is this new sex morality necessarily inherent in a progressive economic programme?

The answers to these questions will decide our attitude to the Federation. We may decide that within the present system only fair-weather and temporary advances will ever be made, and therefore give our support first to a fundamental change in society; or we may decide that the present system only needs reform, and that we may therefore ignore the greater and press for the lesser gains in the belief that once they are gained they can be held.

The Federation, then, has a twofold aim, first to focus the scattered support which exists for its wide programme of reforms, and second to compel those of us who support any item of that programme to think out the reason and the implication of that support, the relation of each part of the programme to the whole, and finally the relation of the lesser reforms to the primary issue of economic and world reorganization. In its short career it has already achieved something of the first of those aims; but it may well be that its most useful function will ultimately prove to have been the second.

CHAPTER VII

REFORM OF THE CRIMINAL LAW

by
D. N. PRITT, K.C.

“Law Reform.

Modernization of criminal and civil law procedure,
including—

- (a) Abolition of capital and merely retributive punishment.
- (b) Provision for the segregation and remedial treatment of socially harmful individuals.”

The Basis of the Federation of Progressive Societies
and Individuals.

CHAPTER VII

REFORM OF THE CRIMINAL LAW

Introductory

If the treatment of criminals had the same “news value” as crime, the tragic human and material waste of the present administration of the criminal law would be cured in a decade; but, as things stand, it is extremely difficult to stimulate public interest in any of the complex social problems connected with crime. Opinion is, however, slowly awakening, both in general and in official circles. On some points, indeed, we have the not very common phenomenon of official opinion being actually hampered by a public opinion that is too reactionary and unenlightened to give it rein.

The purpose of this essay is to examine the system as it stands, and to suggest the more urgently necessary reforms. The area of our problem embraces the whole course of official or semi-official activity from the moment of the arrest of or charge of any person destined to be found guilty of an offence against the criminal law down through the various stages of judicial proceedings to conviction; and then on through the period of “punishment” and “after-care,” until he either melts into the general body of society or starts the melancholy round again with a new charge. Limitations of space will involve the omission, or very sketchy treatment, of some not unimportant matters, but it is hoped that nothing essential will be ignored.

In the course of our study we shall have to consider the judges (with their juries), the law they administer, the procedure they follow, the sanctions (or "punishments") they impose, the prisons and similar institutions with their personnel, and finally the organization of "after-care" and its personnel.

Let us turn at once to the examination of the present position, a picture of general despair lightened by elements of hope.

I. Despair: The System of To-Day

THE JUDGES

By the judges, I mean not merely, or even principally, the judges of the High Court, but all persons who preside over trials of criminal charges. Every criminal case starts, and all but a small percentage (the more serious cases) finish, in petty sessional courts, often called police courts or magistrate's courts. Every petty sessional court consists of a varying number of Justices of the Peace, sitting without a jury. In some parts of London, and in a number of the larger provincial towns, all or some of the cases will be tried by "stipendiaries," that is to say, barristers appointed as paid whole-time magistrates; but the vast majority of cases in petty sessional courts come before unpaid laymen appointed as "Justices of the Peace." Once appointed, they are hardly ever dismissed, and there is no retiring age. In the majority of cases they have been appointed wholly or partly for political reasons; their understanding of law, criminology, or sociology, is seldom even the subject of enquiry either before or after their appointment; and

any experience they may have of law or procedure is picked up as they go along, after their appointment.

The stipendiary magistrates often give devoted service, and not a few fine criminologists have been found among their ranks; but it cannot be assumed with much confidence that their understanding of criminology or sociology, or their actual experience of work at the criminal Bar, is taken into account at the time of their appointment.

The comparatively small number of cases not finally disposed of at petty sessional courts are dealt with either at Quarter Sessions or at the Assizes or at the Central Criminal Court (the "Old Bailey"). The judges at Quarter Sessions in the counties are the Justices of the Peace over again, sitting now with a jury; the chairman, who has to sum up to the jury, is very often, but by no means always, a trained lawyer (perhaps experienced in criminal law and perhaps not), appointed on the ground of his legal qualifications; the deputy chairman, who may be presiding in another division of the court at the same time, will less often be a trained lawyer. Most large towns and a few small towns have Quarter Sessions of their own, and there the judge is a recorder, sitting, of course, with a jury. Recorders are barristers, and except in the City of London they are part-time judges, sitting at their Quarter Sessions four times a year, and continuing their practices at the Bar during the remainder of their time. Sometimes they have experience of criminal law, and sometimes they have not; and again, whilst many of them make good and understanding criminal judges, it must be comparatively rare that a barrister is appointed a recorder on the ground of any particular acquaintance with criminal problems. At the

Assizes the judge will be a Justice of the King's Bench Division of the High Court, or a Commissioner appointed to take his place. The Justices of the King's Bench Division are fully trained lawyers, who have spent a quarter of a century or more in practice at the Bar before their appointment as judges. Occasionally they have been appointed for political reasons, but in general they are men of standing at the Bar whose work has given them considerable experience of law and advocacy, and they are appointed judges because they have proved to be "successful" barristers in the better sense of that word. Unfortunately, large practices at the Bar tend more and more to be exclusively or almost exclusively civil practices, and the majority of barristers appointed to be King's Bench judges will have done very little work in criminal cases during the ten or fifteen years prior to their appointment. The Commissioners of Assize, barristers of standing appointed to take the place of judges for a few weeks, may be regarded as very similar to the judges in respect of their standing and of the experience they are likely to have had of criminal law.

The position at the Central Criminal Court is a little different from that obtaining anywhere else, but it may be taken to be similar for our purposes to the Assizes.

It will thus be seen that the whole volume of criminal charges in this country is disposed of, and the "punishment" therefor allotted, by judges of various kinds of whom very few are appointed because they are particularly qualified for the work, and not many can even be said to have been trained to take part in the very difficult and vitally important work of deciding questions of fact by judicial enquiry.

The juries, who have to decide the crucial question of fact, "guilty or not guilty", in every case at Assizes and Quarter Sessions, are, of course, purely untrained laymen, gathered together haphazard, and given guidance in their task only by the summing-up of the judge, commissioner, recorder, or chairman of Quarter Sessions at the end of the case.

THE LAW

Now, what is the law administered by these various judges? It is a mixture of unwritten "common law," some partial codification of common law, and a rather disorderly set of statutes passed from time to time, creating new offences. Apart from the weighty sociological objection that it renders criminal many acts that were better left outside its scope, and leaves untouched or almost untouched many seriously anti-social activities, the main defect of the law as it stands is the lack of orderly arrangement and of certainty, as a result of which it is often only possible to ascertain whether any course of conduct does or does not come within the criminal law by prolonged and expensive enquiry, often involving appeals.

THE PROCEDURE

Minor offences are tried out, generally speaking, before Justices of the Peace or stipendiaries in petty sessional courts, an uncertain number of justices or one stipendiary, as the case may be, hearing the case without a jury, and with or without the assistance of advocates on one side or the other. The more serious offences are the subject of a preliminary judicial investigation in the same court,

which looks to the casual observer very much like a trial, but is in fact only an enquiry as to whether there is a *prima facie* case for trial before a jury at the Assizes or Quarter Sessions; if there appears to be no such *prima facie* case, the accused is discharged; and if there is such a case, it is sent on (or "committed") to the Assizes or Quarter Sessions for the actual trial.

The procedure is in matters of detail somewhat complicated and confusing to laymen. The requirements of strict proof and the many restrictions on the admissibility of evidence (designed mainly to secure that innocent men shall not be convicted), often make it unnecessarily difficult to convict the guilty, and fill not merely the inexperienced accused, but even the more or less experienced advocates who may represent them, with confusion and dismay.

THE LAWYERS

Both barristers and solicitors take part in the judicial investigation of criminal charges. In the petty sessional courts both branches of the profession are entitled to appear; at the Assizes and the Central Criminal Court, and (with very few exceptions) at Quarter Sessions, barristers alone can conduct cases, the solicitors doing the important work of preparing the case for hearing. In actual practice, scarcely any accused persons have either solicitor or barrister to represent them at petty sessional courts, and a surprisingly large number are unrepresented even at Assizes and Quarter Sessions.

In the education of barristers and solicitors, no attention whatever is paid to their preparation for taking part in criminal cases beyond a not very full teaching

and examination in criminal law and procedure. Criminology, penology, sociology, psychology, are not merely wholly absent from the curricula, but, it is to be feared, any suggestion for their inclusion would be received by most members of either branch with astonishment.

SANCTIONS

With few exceptions, every conviction is followed by what lawyers call sanctions, and what is commonly called "punishment." For want of a better word, we may, perhaps, classify all the various sanctions as sentences.

For different offences, by different persons, of various ages, there is now a wide variety of sentence. One may be bound over to keep the peace; one may be put on probation; one may be fined, with imprisonment in default of payment; one may be confined for a shorter or a longer term in prisons of various kinds, or in a Borstal institution, or in a Home Office school; one may be whipped (that being called "corporal punishment"), or killed (this being called "capital punishment"). The sentence is imposed by the judge, and the judge alone; that is to say, at petty sessions, and County Quarter Sessions, by all the justices present, consulting together, and at Assizes and Borough Quarter Sessions by the judge, commissioner, or recorder, the jury having nothing to do with the matter. Of this very large and miscellaneous body of judicial authorities, trained or untrained, old or less old, tired or vigorous, only a very small proportion has any real understanding of the problems of crime and punishment, of temptation to crime and its reactions, even of prison treatment and its effects. The

proportion of them who could return a satisfactory answer, either generally or in respect of any particular case, as to the sociological basis on which they assess the nature and degree of the sentences they pass, would be small, and attempts to co-ordinate or systematize sentences have generally failed. The sentence, whatever it be, is assessed once and for all at the time, and is not subsequently revised (although prisoners can earn remission for good conduct according to a regular scale, and long-sentence prisoners are sometimes released before their term has expired). The mere fact that a prisoner is really cured, and both willing and able to resume a useful and crime-free life, no more gives a claim to release before his allotted sentence expires than the fact that he is certain to resume a life of crime deprives him of the right to release at the end of his term. In most cases, at the time of the imposition of the sentence, the only information before the court is a statement by a police official, almost always on hearsay, as to the convicted person's habits and character, and a list of previous convictions and sentences. If the sentence be a monetary fine, it is generally imposed without enquiry into the means or responsibilities of the accused, and in some cases results in a man whom the court does not want to suffer imprisonment being compelled to go to prison for want of money to pay the fine. If the sentence be one of probation, it is far more likely to be of use; but many courts will not make sufficient use of the probation system, and in not a few districts the working of the system is hampered by lack of the funds necessary to pay for treatment that may be essential to cure, and by lack of adequately paid and qualified staff. Borstal treatment, and the various

forms of Home Office school, available, of course, only for the relatively young, are not wholly satisfactory, but they are at any rate far better than the normal prison. "Corporal punishment," which can be imposed on boys under fourteen for any indictable offence (i.e. for any offence that can be sent for trial to Assizes or Quarter Sessions, whether or not it can also be dealt with at petty sessions), but can only be imposed on older persons for certain offences selected somewhat haphazard, is almost always accompanied (except in the case of boys under fourteen) by a sentence of imprisonment as well; it is best left undescribed. Capital punishment, which needs no description, is reserved in practice as the obligatory penalty for a particular form of homicide, extremely difficult to define, and divided from other forms of voluntary homicide (grouped under the name of manslaughter) by no very clear or logical difference.

Sentences of ordinary imprisonment or penal servitude, the latter much rarer than the former, are still, however, the normal sentence upon persons committing serious crimes (the persons who provide the major part of criminal problems).

PRISONS

So we must now examine the ordinary prisons, which are mainly divided into convict and local prisons; and, if we pay more attention to the old-fashioned prison than to the rather more hopeful phenomena of modern penology (Borstal, probation, and similar efforts), it is not out of any desire to present too gloomy a picture, or to belittle the efforts of the many enlightened officials who work hard in the face of obstacles to achieve first

one minor success and then another, but merely because the ordinary prison constitutes the greater and the more difficult part of the whole problem. Prisons still consist mainly of institutions where the prisoner is enclosed for the whole period of his sentence (less remission for good conduct); where he has very limited opportunity for intercourse with his fellow-men (whether fellow-convicts or free men); where he passes a short working day in workshops badly equipped with obsolete machinery, having no incentive to improve his output or his skill; where he spends long hours of solitary confinement in his cell, his monotonous existence being relieved only by occasional concerts or lectures given by voluntary effort; where, in short, he leads an existence as little fitted as can well be conceived to equip him to face life with hope, courage, or efficiency on his release, or to induce a "better frame of mind." Little wonder is it that the percentage of those who return, although the true statistics are not available, is certainly high, and that few of those who have been to prison twice fail to become professional criminals.

Of the personnel of the prison system it would be ungracious to say more than that most of them struggle, in the face of misguided economy, public indifference, and the almost complete absence of any hope of drastic and far-reaching reform of the system, to do their best to work in tolerable fashion an intolerable system.

AFTER-CARE

What must we say of "after-care"? Again, it is ungracious to write disparagingly of the efforts of many noble-minded persons; but the plain truth is that in

organization, numbers, and resources, the various bodies that seek to help discharged prisoners to resume their social life without relapsing into crime are so pitifully inadequate to the tremendous task they have to face that they remind one of children building a wall of sand on the seashore to resist the oncoming tide.

II. Hope: The Reforms of To-morrow

So much for the present system, which it is hoped has been fairly, if briefly, described. We must now turn to the question of reform, taking one by one the departments that have just been described, criticizing the main defects associated with them, and outlining the reforms for which these defects seem to call. Fortunately, it can be asserted with confidence that reform is feasible. No one suggests that the problem is simple; but it is not hopeless. A little courage, a little money, a little thought, will carry matters a long way. Two points of a general nature may be stated before details are approached; the first, that reform can only usefully proceed on broad lines of fundamental change, involving an almost complete breach with past traditions; the second, that many departments of reform that present almost insoluble difficulties under existing conditions will become comparatively simple when economic or social reforms, not primarily directed to the elimination of crime, have been carried out.

THE JUDGES

Turning to detailed criticism and suggestion, we take first in order the judges. Here we are faced with an important distinction which it is essential to grasp and

to remember, the distinction between the proceedings up to the verdict and the proceedings after the verdict. So far as the judicial proceedings from the time of charge or arrest are concerned, the work consists of the investigation of questions of fact or law in court, work of great difficulty (far more so than is generally supposed), but work which trained lawyers are best qualified to carry out, whether as judges or advocates. After the verdict, the work is purely sociological, and consists in the formation of an opinion, on such material as is available or is actually used, as to what form of treatment shall best be applied to the guilty person. This is at present done (with one or two grotesque exceptions, which are worse even than the norm) by the judge who presided at the trial, and is generally done then and there without further delay.

Now, how does the existing system work, and what reforms are required? The system, broadly speaking, works badly. In the first stage, in which trained lawyers are *prima facie* the best persons for the work, the vast bulk of it is done by untrained persons, and with a substantial number of exceptions they are, to speak frankly, quite unequal to the very difficult task. A small but not unimportant section of the work, which is done by trained lawyers, is, again with a substantial number of exceptions, done pretty well; but the presence of the jury at Assizes and Quarter Sessions renders the work in some ways additionally difficult. In the second stage, where the qualifications demanded are an intimate knowledge of the causes of crime and the nature of the treatment available, and a developed capacity to judge how the prisoner will react to the various treatments to which he

may be subjected, it is obvious that neither the trained nor the untrained judges under the present system have any real hope, save in a few rare cases of natural sympathy and understanding, of doing their work properly, and that, even if they had, the material before them is utterly inadequate in practice to enable them to realize it.

The remedies for this desperate state of affairs must obviously be thoroughgoing. The problems are not insoluble. All the judges must be fully trained. A country, which for many years has insisted on virtually every civil case involving over forty shillings being tried at the least by a county court judge, has no right to leave the decision of criminal cases, of incomparably greater social importance, to amateurs, and the task of replacing all the Justices of the Peace by stipendiaries should be undertaken at once and carried out steadily. To objectors on the score of expense I would reply, first, that we have no right whatever to work our criminal law badly, and that if we cannot work it properly we may as well abandon it altogether; and secondly, that the expense and waste directly and indirectly resulting from mistried cases and uncured criminals is far greater than the cost of staffing courts properly. (One is reminded of the recent case of a Borough that "could not afford" a few shillings a week to supply milk for three sickly children of an unemployed labourer, and is now driven to "afford" to expend £5 a week for an indefinite number of years in the attempt to save those children from active tuberculosis largely due to malnutrition.)

But when we speak of employing trained judges, what form of training should they receive? Are we to continue to employ for the trial of criminal cases judges who have

generally been appointed on the strength of their experience in civil cases? The answer probably is that the employment of stipendiaries, recorders, and High Court judges appointed and trained by existing methods, whilst leaving much to be desired, will be a tolerably workable system, so far as the trial of cases is concerned, if, and only if, the delicate task of sentencing the guilty is dealt with differently.

There could hardly be two more different functions than that of deciding or assisting to decide by judicial enquiry whether a particular person has or has not been guilty of a particular crime, and that of deciding which (and how much) of a large variety of available remedial measures is best calculated to turn the person so guilty into a useful and independent citizen. Both are important functions; but the one is a lawyer's job, and the other a piece of social service, a task for sociologists, for psychologists, for doctors, for anyone but a pure lawyer. A reform far more important and valuable than may appear at first sight will, therefore, be the complete separation, in all but the least important of offences, of the trial from the sentence; and the task of allotting sentences should be entrusted to some person or persons selected for their experience of prison life and administration and their knowledge of the prison population, of social conditions, and of the causes of crime. It will almost certainly be better that the sentencing body (which might well be called "the corrective commission," and would work at first under the Prison Commission and later under the Ministry of Justice) should consist of not less than half a dozen people, selected in such a way as to combine among themselves all the various qualities required.

It will no doubt include some psychologists, some persons promoted from the probation service, some educationalists, some ordinary citizens, and after a time some convicts. How they should do their work will be discussed below, under "*Sanctions*."

THE JURY

Before passing from the problem of the judges, we must deal with the kindred problem of the jury. This is only relevant in connection with the trial, and has nothing to do with sentences. It is, nevertheless, an anxious matter. Fair and efficient trial is vital, and nobody need be ashamed to assert that, whilst it is of paramount importance that innocent men should not be found guilty, it is also of no use to anyone that guilty men should escape. Such escape brings the law into contempt and destroys that certainty of conviction which is regarded as the real strength of a well-managed criminal law.

Now juries do in fact often acquit persons whom impartial but expert observers regard as clearly guilty, and not infrequently convict persons in cases where those observers would say that the accused was probably innocent, or at any rate that it was "not safe to convict." The jury system does not work well. At the same time, one must be careful how one sets about its abolition. Public sentiment is somewhat unthinkingly but definitely in its favour. It is widely, although perhaps wrongly, regarded as a safeguard of personal liberty; and the presence of some lay element in a legal tribunal does in fact help to check that vice which even the best of lawyers, left to themselves, may develop, the vice of technicality. The lay element should therefore remain,

and the real problem is what form it should take. For myself, I think that many possibilities of misunderstanding and error would be eliminated if the jury were replaced by two or three assessors, who would sit with the judge and retire with him to consider the verdict, the judge having power to overrule their opinion, but being bound, if he should think fit to do so, to state in open court his reasons for so doing.

THE LAW

We must now turn to the law itself. This is in need of a good many minor reforms, and of the greater simplicity and certainty that will follow upon good and careful codification (but not upon bad). One may be forgiven for not developing this part of the subject at greater length; it is not as urgent as other parts of the problem, and the actual improvement of the provisions of the law will come almost automatically with the general reformation of society.

THE PROCEDURE

With regard to criminal procedure, perhaps the most urgent reform is the establishment of machinery whereby accused persons may take some real part in the proceedings by being provided with proper representation.

The complication of procedure, the division of the profession into two branches, and the relatively high economic standing of lawyers, combine to make legal aid very expensive, and the existing provisions for the supply of free legal aid are utterly inadequate. In cases of any complexity it is virtually impossible, however hard the judge may try to help, for an accused person to put his

case adequately without the aid of solicitors and barristers, and that, too, supplied not merely an hour or two before the actual trial, but long enough in advance to permit of real preparation of the case and collection of witnesses. At present, with insignificant exceptions, such aid cannot be obtained except by those who can pay the market price. This scandal should cease at once. It should be as much a matter of course that solicitors and counsel should be furnished to the defence (in the first instance at the public expense) as it is that they should be furnished to the prosecution, and there is much to be said for the suggestion that solicitors and barristers employed by the Government in criminal cases should change about and act as regularly for the defence as for the prosecution, in order to prevent them from getting too much into one groove. The courts should have, and should exercise, a much more extensive power of ordering costs to be paid by unsuccessful defendants as well as by unsuccessful prosecutions. Solicitors acting for defendants should be able to feel confident that, although their expenditure will be scrutinized by proper "taxation of costs," they are at liberty to embark on any reasonable enquiry into facts in search of the evidence necessary for the purpose of properly putting their client's defence before the court.

Another point on which reform is required is that of the preliminary procedure before magistrates in connection with all cases that go to Assizes or Quarter Sessions. The opportunity afforded by the preliminary proceedings of both knowing and testing the whole of the prosecution's evidence is generally regarded, not without some justification, as one of the safeguards of the defence; but in practice it brings unnecessary disadvantages both

to the defence itself and to the prosecution. The defence has the burden of the expense, delay, and labour involved in what is practically a double trial, which is rendered more vexatious in a number of cases by the fact that a weak magistrate may often let a case go forward for trial when he really ought to make up his mind then and there that it is not strong enough.

EVIL EFFECTS OF PUBLICITY

More serious is the effect of modern publicity. In any case involving elements of passion, drama, or mere dirt, the Press, which rightly or wrongly thinks that its public wants to read all about it, will report it at such length during the preliminary proceedings that practically every member of the jury empanelled to try the case at Assizes or Quarter Sessions a few weeks later will enter the box knowing or believing himself to know a great deal about it, with his mind in consequence partly or wholly, consciously or unconsciously, made up. This is bad enough in any case, but in cases where evidence has been admitted before the magistrates which ought not to have been admitted (evidence which sometimes will not even be tendered on the final trial), it amounts almost inevitably to a denial of justice. The remedy for this is not easy to specify. It would be simple to forbid the reporting of the proceedings before the magistrates, but there are very real dangers and disadvantages in this. The remedy which appeals to me personally, although it requires a good deal of thought before it could be applied with confidence, would be the abolition of preliminary proceedings before magistrates, and the substitution therefor of a careful and elaborate preliminary enquiry

by officials (this constituting a development of the enquiry that in any event takes place at present before a case is opened to the magistrates), with provision for the supply to the defence some time before the trial of copies of the statements of the witnesses. A disadvantage to the prosecution of the present system is that it gives to a dishonest defendant the maximum opportunity of learning the whole of the prosecution's case and then concocting a defence at his leisure. It is not easy to avoid some risk of this, but a high degree of certainty of conviction of the guilty is of such social value that anything tending to increase it is worthy at the least of careful consideration, unless it also tends to increase the risk of convicting the innocent.

SIMPLIFICATION OF COURT PROCEDURE

The simplification of the actual court procedure, in particular by large relaxations of the present strict rules as to the admissibility of evidence, is commonly regarded as too prejudicial to the defence in criminal cases to be advisable; but there is a great deal to be said for the view that before fully trained judges, sitting without a jury (whether with or without assessors), the rules of evidence could be allowed to disappear almost entirely without any injustice to either side, and with a great gain in clarity, directness, and simplicity of trial. This reform will not be of first-rate urgency, if proper provision is made, as above indicated, for the legal representation of accused persons. But at a later stage of development it will probably be found of real social advantage.

Finally, a minor but very useful reform of procedure will be the introduction of machinery, on the lines of the

partie civile procedure of France and other countries, for the trial at the same time as the criminal charge of any civil claim which may be made by persons directly injured by the crime in question. There is substantial social and psychological value in linking up restitution or compensation to the injured person with the social correction of the guilty.

THE LAWYERS

I have little space for a discussion of the advantages or disadvantages of reorganizing the legal profession and uniting its two branches. It may be affirmed of the lawyers, as of the judges, that the reform of their system of training, education, and remuneration will not be as urgent as some other reforms, if they do not take part, either in their existing occupation as advocates or in their potential future occupation as judges, in the determination of sentences.

SANCTIONS

We come now to the most important field of reform, that of sanctions, and must begin by some consideration of first principles. It must be confessed that in their actual application present-day theories of punishment rank high among the phenomena of confused thinking. It seems to be still widely held by people who appear superficially to be civilized that it is right and socially useful to inflict retributive punishment on others simply because they have acted wrongly, in order to "vindicate the law." It is even more widely held to be right to inflict on a convicted person a more severe sentence than one would impose on him "on his own merits," in an effort

to persuade not him but other unspecified persons not to commit similar offences, to punish him, in fact, "as an example to others"; and it is, of course, almost universally held that it is justifiable to subject men who have committed serious offences to the unpleasantness of personal imprisonment without any remedial, educative treatment, merely in the hope of deterring them from committing further offences. It is submitted as a fundamental condition, not only of proper criminal reform but also of our claim to rank as a civilized race, that the public in general and those engaged in criminal administration in particular should accept the following principles:

- (a) That retributive punishment is wholly evil, injuring not only the victim, but all those directly concerned in the infliction, and in the long run the community as a whole. (The word "punishment" should disappear from our vocabulary, and the whole conception of retributive punishment from our minds.)
- (b) That there are only two possible motives or justifications for depriving convicted persons of their liberty, the first being to achieve their cure in the broad sense of the word, that is to say, their restoration to a state of physical, mental, and economic stability in which they will be unlikely to commit further offences, and the second to prevent the demonstrably incurable criminal from committing serious offences which, being incurably criminal, he will be sure to commit if he is left at liberty.

- (c) That no measure of restraint not justified by a consideration of the merits and circumstances of his particular case can be applied to any convicted person merely by way of deterrence to others. (If a term in prison is not the proper treatment for Jones, who has committed a particular offence, it is no more right to send Jones to prison for the supposed improvement of Smith than it would be to do so if Jones had committed no offence at all.)

ABOLITION OF CORPORAL AND CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

Turning to the various kinds of sentences that may be imposed, it will be well to dispose first of those forms that should be wholly abolished. Corporal and capital punishment should go, wholly and at once. As to the former, overwhelming evidence has been established that this obscene savagery brutalizes both the person who inflicts it and the person who suffers it. Its maintenance in England is a standing disgrace to the reputation for humanity which we believe ourselves to enjoy, and has the odd and unfortunate result in nearly every European country that any effort of English reformers to promote the reform of Continental prison systems is regarded merely as one more instance of British hypocrisy. Capital punishment could, perhaps, as a mere matter of logic, be justified by a complete certainty that the convicted person could never again be a useful citizen under any circumstances. But it is, of course, utterly impossible to achieve any such certainty; on the contrary, it is well known that reprieved murderers are the most satisfactory members of the prison population.

Capital punishment stands condemned by a great majority of right-thinking people.

PROBATION AND FINES

Of more or less civilized sentences, probation may, perhaps, be regarded as the most desirable, for it should be regarded as fundamental that no one should suffer deprivation of personal liberty if he offers any reasonable hope of social regeneration without that extreme measure. The probation service should be a Government service, and a probationary staff adequate both in numbers and training should be available in every district. The difficulty caused by the reluctance of some courts to put convicted persons on probation would be automatically overcome, if proper "corrective commissions" dealt with the question of sentence.

Fines, preferably associated with restitution or compensation to injured parties, constitute admirable measures of social correction for many offences, since they do normally tend to induce in the person fined a disinclination to repeat the offence, and they involve no stigma or social damage. But to impose fines without any proper consideration of the means of the offender is as foolish and dangerous as to give a child medicine without any knowledge of its health. Even nowadays, with improved arrangements for giving people time to pay fines, there are very large numbers who, simply because they could not pay a fine which has been automatically imposed without any enquiry into their financial position, are serving short terms of imprisonment which were not intended or desired by the magistrates, and which waste public money, impair the social utility of the victim, and

induce a sense of frustration and bitterness that may do the community incalculable harm. No fine should be inflicted without careful enquiry into the defendant's financial position. An order for imprisonment in default of payment should be the exception and not as at present the rule, and in appropriate cases fines should be collected by weekly payments (if necessary through the machinery of the county court).

IMPRISONMENT

The last form of sentence requiring discussion is imprisonment, by which is meant any form of treatment involving general deprivation of personal liberty. As indicated above, every such sentence passed on persons offering reasonable hope of cure should be designed simply to achieve cure, and every such sentence passed on those few offering no reasonable hope of cure (the psychologically unstable, the definitely certifiable mental cases, and the mere irreconcilable criminal, the "hard-boiled" who has been boiled hard in the cauldron of a misshapen society), should be designed merely to restrain him from committing further offences.

In respect of the first of the two classes of persons who have to be "imprisoned," the corrective commission will examine all the available material, collected by the probation personnel, by the police, or by the friends of the prisoner himself, bearing on the prisoner's surroundings, education, economic conditions, health, mentality, and history generally, including the report of the trial itself, will interview the prisoner, giving him, of course, full opportunity to check or contradict the information before them, and will then decide which of the various

forms of prison treatment available will be best calculated to establish or re-establish the prisoner as a useful member of society. His case will come up for review periodically before the same commission, who will decide whether he should be released either provisionally or finally. The sentence when first imposed will be a maximum period, beyond which the prisoner cannot lawfully be detained; but it should be regarded as a perfectly normal proceeding for prisoners to be discharged as apparently cured long before the maximum period has expired. Logically, of course, there is no more reason for deciding in advance at what date a man must be discharged from prison than there is for deciding in advance how long a man should remain in hospital; but it is in practice essential to impose a time limit, to guard against possible abuses, to prevent the prisoner himself from acquiring a feeling of hopelessness, and to avoid antagonizing public opinion. Indeed, it will be necessary to secure that the temptation to fix the maximum too high, in the easy-going belief that after all the man will probably not serve it at all, is sternly resisted, and to educate public opinion to understand that the maximum period is not the period for which the prisoner is really likely to remain under restraint.

All that the corrective commission or anyone else will be able to do for the apparently incurable is to select carefully the right institution for them. The nature of these institutions will be discussed below.

THE PRISONS

What may be called for the moment prisons will be divided into two main genera and numbers of species. The most important genus, in some ways, will contain

the prisons designed for the treatment of curable persons who have committed serious or fairly serious offences. They will not be very easy-going places, but there will be no restrictions for restrictions' sake, and the stupidity of trying to make prison so unpleasant that the victim will be quite sure never to commit a crime again (the main result of which is to unfit him for anything except crime) will have disappeared for good. The whole organization and régime of these places will be devoted to helping the inmates to pull themselves together, with a view to leaving, when discharged as apparently cured, in a good state of mental and physical health, and with as much chance as any other citizen of holding their own. To this end life in prison must resemble life outside as much, not as little, as possible. Gaps in the men's education will be made good where they are young enough and intelligent enough for this to be still feasible. They will learn a trade, if they have not already a trade; they will work hard and regularly at work which they do not suspect of being merely futile; they will be properly paid for their work and will in turn pay for their keep; they will have extended freedom in the matters of writing and receiving letters and of visits; they will in most cases have short holidays at regular intervals; and when in an advanced state of cure they will probably be discharged for a definite or indefinite period of months on probation.

It has, of course, to be admitted that many of these proposals are even more difficult of application than they sound. The problem of satisfactorily finding work for prisoners has puzzled able and humane intelligences for a long time, and there is no doubt that it is extremely difficult to solve until the problem of finding work or

proper maintenance for those outside prison has been solved. In this as in other respects a little sanity applied on a large scale to our general economic and industrial problems will make most prison problems shrink to very small dimensions. But prison problems, even as things stand, cannot be buried and need not cause despair. There are limited classes of work, showing no immediate commercial profit but of real social advantage, which can be undertaken, and they must be undertaken with vigour and courage.

PRISON SUBSTITUTES

It is probably not necessary to discuss in detail the various forms of institutions which will take the place of prisons for the curable. They may vary according to the age, intelligence, criminal history, or health of the prisoners to be sent to them; they may vary in accordance with the exigencies of the industrial situation; they may be village colonies or open or semi-open camps, and a few of them may still have walls. They will in any case be very different from the typical prison of to-day. The new institutions will tend to obliterate the present distinction between the various forms of present-day prisons and Borstal institutions or Home Office schools.

Institutions of the second genus, designed to prevent by physical restraint the commission of criminal offences by persons who simply cannot be stopped by any other means, present a problem of their own, demanding anxious consideration. The present system, whilst not in general erring on the side of leniency, certainly fails to protect society, since it regularly releases at the end of their sentences criminals whom it has made no real

attempt to cure, and who are quite certain to return immediately to serious crime. If any person, through his own defects or those of the community, has become, in fact, incapable of living at large without committing anti-social acts of a nature too grave to be tolerated, society has a right to restrain him, but not to destroy his life and injure its own by inflicting useless cruelty on him. Such persons will be confined with varying degrees of closeness in institutions of several kinds, adapted to their different forms of disability. Those who are socially harmless except when they have been drinking alcohol might reside with very little restriction in some area so geographically arranged as to make it practicable to exclude all prohibited imports. Those who are mentally "border-line cases" might be placed in a spacious walled-in area resembling the better mental hospitals. Some cases might even be placed on parole in some special area of many square miles, and some will have to be incarcerated in something very like the present prison, always provided that the conditions of incarceration are not intolerable. All that are capable of wholly or partly supporting themselves should be enabled to do so in the same way as the curable convicts; and all except those unfitted for it should be entitled to free access within their institutions or restricted areas to their friends and relations.

Little need be said of the prison personnel, for prisons when reformed will be entirely different institutions. But the personnel will improve with the reforms. There are very many admirable people already at work under the present system, and suitable conditions of service, coupled with the reform of prisons, will bring in many others. The importance of staffing the new institutions

with persons of the very highest character and sympathy cannot be exaggerated, but there is no reason to fear that the human material for this staff cannot be found.

AFTER-CARE

After-care, like prison work, is a problem which is nearly insoluble under present conditions, and almost self-solving under any sane reorganization of society. The great difficulties at present are the difficulty of finding work at all when so many are unemployed, the extra complications of the "stigma," and the devastating effect of prison life in unfitting men for normal life. A socialized system of government will solve the first; a reformed prison system will solve the last. When these two problems have been solved, the stigma will largely disappear through the healthier state of the public mind, and will in any case lose much of its strength from the mere fact that a man ready to work will have become an asset instead of a liability. It is worth remarking that the prison system of the U.S.S.R., which has received a very fine and well-deserved advertisement from recent events, has achieved a very high percentage of cures in its criminal institutions with very little after-care organization, largely because the discharged prisoner comes out of prison more fit for regular work than he was when he went in, and because the labour of his hand or brain is really needed by the community in which he lives.

Conclusion

I am conscious of many points that have been left untouched in this necessarily brief sketch. Nothing has

been written of children who commit crimes, of bail, of remand, of the futility of short sentences, of the horrors of endless sentences of imprisonment for abnormalities which only doctors can cure, of the necessity for further provision for appeals from convictions and other orders of the various courts, and little of the scandal of imprisonment for non-payment of money. In all or most of these matters the nature of the necessary reforms is almost as self-evident as the necessity itself.

It is useful, perhaps, in conclusion to deal with one or two objections of a general nature that may be raised. I suspect that it may be said that the reforms proposed are too expensive, are unpractical, or will encourage crime by pampering the criminal. To the first objection, it may well be answered that the direct and indirect financial profit from curing even a dozen serious criminals would of itself meet the cost of many of the reforms suggested; that one battleship would pay for the lot; that an intelligently organized prison system would nearly pay for itself by the output of manufactured goods alone; and that, if we "cannot afford" to cure crime decently, we had better abandon all claim to civilization. To the second objection, I retort that practically every reform I have suggested above is already in actual operation, wholly or partially, in one country or another at the present time, and I believe that the bulk of these reforms will, within a comparatively short space of years, seem quite commonplace. To the objection of "pampering" criminals there are many answers. One of the best is that the system of not pampering them, which, in spite of the best efforts of humane officials, remained in full force until recently at Dartmoor, cannot claim to have

been so conspicuous a success as to preclude a trial of the opposite system. But it may be added with confidence that the very best of prisons is not likely to remain sufficiently attractive to make people enter it, if once life outside is given the modest measure of security and comfort which modern productivity has made possible and which only the present organization of distribution withholds from realization.

CHAPTER VIII
OUR PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

by

CLOUGH WILLIAMS-ELLIS, F.R.I.B.A.

CHAPTER VIII

OUR PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

THE "AMENITY-MINDED," ARE THEY CRANKS?

The "amenity-minded," who demand some graciousness in life's physical pattern, are still suspect to the average Englishman. Inevitably; since the average Englishman is a slum-dweller in an industrial town, long inured to muddle and squalor, while even the average countryman regards a non-barbaric sensitiveness to surroundings as "odd," "unpractical," cranky. . . .

Yet perhaps there is not quite the old uncritical approval of enterprise and activity of almost any sort for its own sake. We are, I think, slowly coming to judge actions by their results, ultimate and communal, as well as immediate and individual. We have definitely begun to realize that to go as you please is no way to arrive at what is pleasant, and that private rights are no longer defensible when they result in public wrongs.

OR BORES?

The trouble about the things I am here concerned with is two-fold: first, that so much of what is really stark common sense has been overlaid by a sticky coat of sentiment, and, secondly, that those who are apt to interest themselves in matters of "amenity" (however widely interpreted) too often degenerate into BORES.

That, in this regard, I have long since become one myself I am well aware, yet I take comfort in reflecting that even such shining reformers (or would-be reformers)

as Cobbet, Robert Owen, Ruskin, William Morris, Patric Geddes, Raymond Unwin, Patric Abercrombie, and even H. G. Wells, have all and severally been called bores by those who have found their views uncongenial.

When John Ruskin dared to stray away from the abstractions of aesthetic criticism (which were held to be genteel and perfectly harmless) and boldly descended into the economic and social field, questioning, amongst other things, the current distribution of wealth; certain outraged notables protested that they were being "preached to death by a mad governess."

So crazy and topsy-turvy indeed is this England of ours and its evaluations even to-day, that it is still difficult to secure the recognition and acceptance as "practical" or "necessary" of any step that is not nakedly "useful" in an immediate (mostly selfish) profit-making sense, and so plainly and simply materialistic in its advantages as to seem good even to a Borough Councillor whose concern, rightly beginning with sewage disposal and rates, quite wrongly also ends there.

WANTED A SCALE OF VALUES

What is involved, of course, is a matter of values. The nineteenth century believed so single-heartedly in money values to the large exclusion of others, that it made Bradford, Oldham, Leeds, and Sheffield. Even to-day our English towns seem, when counting their blessings, to give almost exclusive prominence to such things as mileage of tramway track, rateable value, the price of gas, and the increase in population since the last census. These may or may not be matters for congratulation, but they are not the sort of things that make one love one's

town; they have little or nothing to do with "Delight." You cannot make songs about sanitation or gas thermometers or reduced tram fares or municipal statistics; and you cannot love what you cannot sing about.

Berlin sings about its avenue of linden trees, Aberdovey about its bells (which are mythical), and Wigan about its pier, which it valiantly invented, as it would have had to invent anything else that it could sing about with any pride or affection. Save, of course, its own indomitable citizens. For its pathos and wry humour, "Wigan Pier" can only be matched by a few of the wartime marching songs compounded at once of cynicism and heartache. Only intolerable conditions can produce such songs. English industrial towns produce them.

DO WE DESERVE OUR TOWNS?

Meanness, inefficiency, waste, and misery apart, national economics, national stability, and even national pride apart, is not our claim to be counted a civilized people a little premature, when the knowledge of the existence of intolerable conditions for others is still by no means intolerable to ourselves?

We are agreed—are we not?—that our towns of to-day do our intelligence and our humanity small credit, and our pride and sense of beauty still less.

On the whole, we have got the sort of towns that the ordinary sort of councillor approves of—probably because he has never seen any better—and we must, therefore, have councillors of a new type with new and quite different standards and ambitions for their towns. We want, in short, to leaven our solid ranks of essential Marthas with an adequate sprinkling of no less necessary

Marys. If these more liberal-minded and sensitive men and women (there are such in every town) are reluctant to face the discomforts of municipal politics—or even if they do face them, yet fail to get elected—we ought none the less to make sure that amenity interests are duly represented.

CO-OPTION OF THE AMENITY-MINDED

To this end it is suggested that upon every town or city council there should be co-opted a few of those who are by no means content with things as they are, and who have ideas about Open Spaces and trees, about green belts and vistas, local building tradition and architecture, who are, in short, what the majority of the councillors and ratepayers would probably call "cranks." I should hope to find at least one of them a practising poet, if only as a set-off against the overplus of plumbers.

We have seen what the "practical" people have made of our towns, and if ever imagination, vision, and ingenuity were needed to straighten out a tragic tangle, it is now and it is here.

For architects and town-planners there is no need to plead, for, if those who *care* get a hearing, those who *know* will have their hands full soon enough.

We, who try to see a little further than the Town Councillors; who desire and even demand that our civilization be given a more orderly, humane, efficient, and seemly physical setting (in order, perhaps, that it may itself become more truly civilized); we, I say, because we are as yet so few, are still commonly regarded as an eccentric minority, tainted with long-haired aestheticism and philanthropy, suspected of vegetarianism,

and probably addicted to God-knows-what shameful and un-English practices, all of which, of course, is no more than to say that intelligent good-citizenship is still so rare as to seem freakish to the majority.

THE ROAD TO REFORM

Now mere name-calling is only useful up to a point. It is possible to hope that by now that point may be passed, and that even the citizen who is only vaguely aware that things are in a muddle may be interested enough (perhaps merely self-interested) to seek a little information as to how reforms might ultimately and actually be brought about, if he really desires them.

Having, as I feel, rather written myself to something perilously near a standstill on the questions here treated, I have drawn quite unscrupulously on such authorities as Sir Leslie Scott, Sir Lawrence Chubb, and others, partly because they had already said what it seemed to me most needed saying in a manner not to be improved upon, and partly because, having myself sung much the same songs over and over again to different tunes, I am as sick of my own words as are any of my readers.

AUTHOR APOLOGIZES FOR PLAGIARISM

The fact that what follows is partly written from a disorderly hotch-potch of notes and cuttings renders it impossible for me to acknowledge all my sources. But wherever I may have incorporated a chunk conveniently provided by someone else, I know I shall have his thanks, even as he has mine, because his only concern is the spreading of the planning idea. Of such are the children of light.

WHAT WE HAVE TO DO

Well, we have to fit into this island, cities, towns, and villages for our people to live in; factories, workshops, and mines for them to work in; an incredibly elaborate network of communications for transport; room for outdoor recreation and sport; facilities of access for town-dwellers to enjoy the country; and we have at the same time to leave adequate elbow room for British agriculture and, for the farmer, freedom from too much interference by the urban element. And in doing all these things we have also, for all our sakes, and the sake of those to come, to maintain, restore, and even enhance the beauty of England, of her countryside, of her villages, and of her towns.

The end of planning is not mere preservation—although there is much to be preserved—but well-ordered development. To-day, that end can by no means be attained without the proper regional planning of the *whole* country.

ADVANTAGES OF PLANNING

That unplanned development must be wasteful should be a self-evident proposition. The total land assets of the nation, including its buildings and roads, must be worth more, if the layout is good, than if it is bad. In any given area the average value of the property owned by the different owners must be increased, if bad development is prevented and good development is assured. The increment of value produced by the effort of the community should, therefore, be sufficient to defray the compensation justly due to any owner who suffers a net depreciation of value. The cost to Local Authorities of road-making, of the provision of public utilities, such as

water, light, power, drainage, police, etc., is very much less given good planning than with haphazard, uncontrolled development, and the rates are therefore lower.

These inherent economic advantages are, of themselves, reason enough why the nation should at this juncture, when it is attempting to put its economic house in order, insist that *all* our land should be wisely planned; that "proper planning," to use a good phrase of the new Act, should cover the whole of England. But there are other reasons.

AGRICULTURE AND THE TOWNSMAN

Our greatest single industry is still agriculture. Now, agricultural development, apart from necessary farm buildings, does not mean building development at all. On the contrary, the building of houses in country districts for town-dwellers to sleep in at night, and of factories away from centres of population, is an urban invasion of the domain of agriculture. Advantageous though it may be from some national points of view, it is a disadvantage to agriculture. It means a permanent sterilization of agricultural land and a growing urbanization of the agricultural community. Each year this kind of development puts thousands of acres out of cultivation for ever; each year it brings in its train the opinions and habits of life of town-dwellers, with their want of sympathy with agricultural ways of thought, which is more disturbing than is often realized. And yet few will dispute the value of a contented, thriving, agricultural community as a steady factor in national opinion.

The common assumption that land is undeveloped or sterilized when it is permanently reserved for productive

agriculture, and that development means covering good land with the dormitories of our towns, is manifest nonsense. The very notion that "development" excludes agriculture shows how our national outlook has become urbanized, or rather suburbanized. Economically it is a disastrous view, and more than ever so to-day, when we are at last taking some practical steps to bring about a revival of our agriculture.

WHAT A PLANNING AUTHORITY SHOULD DO

A Planning Authority should, among other things and at an early stage, schedule an adequate allowance of Open Spaces. With this object it should make every effort to arrive at terms with landowners which will render compulsory acquisition unnecessary. Planning can be invoked with great effect in this connection, since it provides many opportunities for bargaining. For instance, it can be pointed out to any large landowner that by earmarking a site for a public Open Space, he does not lose the building value of that land; he merely transfers it to his adjacent property, which will be developed far more rapidly and at a higher price when prospective residents realize that the amenities of their building sites will be preserved. Moreover, under Section 21 (5) (b) of the recent Act, the owner of land may set off against the amount of any betterment payable by him the value of "any gift of property whether real or personal" made by him with a view to facilitating the making or carrying into effect of the scheme. This provision will enable the owner of land suitable for a public Open Space to pay part of the betterment in that form, if the gift conforms to the scheme.

COMMONS

Where commons are included within the area of a planning scheme, they should obviously be included as public Open Spaces. Common land may not now be enclosed for any purpose without the sanction of the Minister of Agriculture, and it is, therefore, of little value to the Lord of the Manor or other owner except, possibly, in respect of mineral rights or timber. For that reason the inclusion of commons in a scheme is really an advantage to the owner, since it gives him effective protection against the various nuisances or abuses that sometimes attach to places of public resort when left unregulated.

PROVISION OF OPEN SPACES

The importance attached by the Legislature to the provision of public Open Spaces and Recreation Grounds is shown by Section 26 of the Act, which gives to Local Authorities, including County Councils, if authorized by the Minister, compulsory power to purchase for these purposes land subject to the scheme of another authority. This power will enable the Council of an area already fully developed to buy, at a price to be fixed by an independent valuer, land needed for recreation or amenity outside its own boundaries. But the power will do more than that. It opens the door to the formulation of *National Park Schemes*, and will enable groups of County Councils, Municipal Corporations, and District Councils to co-operate with that end in view.

NATIONAL PARKS

Many of us have felt extreme disappointment at the discovery that, although the Report of the National

Park Committee has been published for nearly two years, nothing has been done to give effect to its recommendations. The fourteen National Parks that Dr. Vaughan Cornish favourably discusses in his admirable book on the subject are not only of great individual and intrinsic merit, but are also well and widely distributed geographically in relation to our great centres of population. The tale of them is as follows: Glen Affric, The Cairngorms, The Cuillins, Tynedale and the Wall, Lakeland, Snowdonia, Dartmoor, the New Forest, the Forest of Dean, Dovedale, the South Downs, Broadland, the Pembroke Coast, and the North Cornwall Coast.

Very properly, he considers the three "mainland" countries of the United Kingdom as one, *tria juncta in uno*, since otherwise an allowance of Parks assessed purely on a population basis would produce the anomaly of one park only in Wales, two in Scotland, and fourteen in England.

For many reasons, the chief of which are geological, the grandest scenery and widest stretches of unenclosed wild land are to be found in the north and west, i.e. in Scotland and in Wales, and against these great basic advantages the rapidly diminishing objection of relative inaccessibility can scarcely weigh, especially as in this small and crowded island it will become increasingly difficult to maintain the necessary industrial and residential vacuum involved by the establishment of a National Park against the increasing pressure of development. Also the very cost of acquisition or sterilization against exploitation drives one automatically to the poor lands, the uncultivated lands, the uplands. It is, therefore, a fortunate chance that these, rather than the rich agricul-

tural and relatively sophisticated parts of the country, are pre-eminently fitted for the variety of needs that a National Park is intended to meet.

VARIETY OF PURPOSES TO BE SERVED BY A PARK

It is this very variety of function and occasionally divergent and even conflicting aims of those who advocate Parks that make some people doubtful about the whole National Park idea. It is pointed out with some truth that the preservation of flora and fauna is scarcely compatible with the dedication of an area as a great playground, and that more would be lost than gained by attracting all and sundry to our most cherished solitudes.

Dr. Cornish is fully alive to these objections, and deals with them convincingly. Unfortunately, in England the word "park" is apt to conjure up a depressing vision of asphalt paths, cast-iron railings, variegated shrubs, band-stands, a profusion of notice-boards, and an aggressive provision of conveniences for ladies and gentlemen. If we were French, we should think more happily in terms of Le Notre, or, if American or Canadian, in terms of soaring mountain ranges and thousands of square miles of virgin forest.

People have even objected that we do not want coconut-shies and merry-go-rounds in the Forest of Dean. Of course we don't. No one in their senses would suggest that we did, for recreation does not yet *necessarily* mean "amusement," and a National Park is a place for the quiet study of Nature in all her manifestations, a place for walking, climbing, and exploration, a place for camping, a paradise for pedestrians, a sanctuary for scenery, and a townsman's refuge from the grinding hurly-burly of his everyday life.

THE LAKES AND SNOWDONIA

For the special preservation of the Lake District we have Wordsworth as a witness: ". . . persons of pure taste throughout the whole island . . . by their visits (often repeated) to the Lakes in the North of England, testify that they deem the district a sort of national property, in which every man has a right and interest, who has an eye to perceive and a heart to enjoy." Surely this almost amounts to a formal proposal that the Lake District should be the National Park of Great Britain.

Perhaps I am partial because it is my own country, and because I gave evidence on its behalf before the Government's National Parks Committee, but I certainly favour the area of Snowdonia (which name, by the way, is of no modern coining, but of so respectable an antiquity as to have been used in the Statute of Wales of 1284) as first candidate for the honour of Nationalization. Having painted the most exciting picture of these Welsh Alps, that all who know them know that they deserve, Dr. Cornish adds: "The argument for the institution of a National Park in Snowdonia is reinforced by the fact that at every entrance of this mountain fastness stands a castle of antiquity, Conway, Carnarvon, Harlech, and the rest, monuments of mediaeval architecture so strong and stern of aspect that without garrison they seem to guard the gates of the historic stronghold of Gwynedd above Conway."

Perhaps, again with personal bias, I feel the claim for the Pembroke coast wellnigh irresistible, not only because of its great intrinsic merit, but also because ribbon building along the coasts of this island has left us so little

else of adequate length and area for preservation on a national scale.

A NATIONAL AMENITY BOARD

I have myself elsewhere pleaded for a National Board of Amenity, and Dr. Cornish with his proposed Board of Scenery seems to support me. Also we seem to agree in considering any project for a National Park worse than useless, if it does not imply a proper control of all developments upon its fringes through the adoption of adequately comprehensive Regional Planning schemes. Dr. Cornish makes it clear also that the National Park must be on a scale hitherto undreamt of in this country. In other words, that it must be truly National, and in no sense a substitute for a competition with the local municipal parks and reservations that one hopes our municipalities will establish whilst they yet may in the immediate neighbourhood of our still growing towns.

A liberal and far-seeing attitude is needed in regard to this important matter, which has so suddenly become an urgent matter. For this reason, short of a change in the valuations upon which public opinion is based, a change which the F.P.S.I. should bend all its energies to effecting, it is highly improbable that any step adequate to the emergency will be taken before it is too late.

DRAFT SCHEME FOR PRESERVING SNOWDONIA

A draft scheme that I formulated for the preservation of Snowdonia (quoted in the National Park Committee's Report) was as follows. I may premise it with the remark that, as I am myself a landowner in the area, I should eagerly welcome any such "Mutual Amenity Insurance

Scheme" for the protection of my own neighbourhood in perpetuity.

(1) Preservation of the *status quo* where the natural scenery is still virgin and most characteristic.

(2) Provision for embellishment and modification where deemed desirable under informed and authoritative guidance only (e.g. tree-planting, path-making, etc. Example, Pass of Aberglasslyn).

(3) Control of all developments whatsoever affecting the amenities, whether within the reserve or adjoining it, by means of special bye-laws and regional planning schemes.

(4) Restriction of such development to certain scheduled areas; entire prohibition of advertisements; control of mineral working; control of elevations and materials and placing of buildings—all under special licence.

Purchase of the whole area is probably impracticable, but control of development is essential. The intrinsic realizable value of nearly all the land of the highest scenic and recreative value is low. Legitimate mineral rights should not be infringed, but operations should be subject to special safeguards for amenity, and irresponsible speculation should be made impossible.

The approved National Park area would be subjected to certain restrictions, by-laws, zonings, sterilizations, etc. These would operate to the financial advantage of certain owners and to the detriment of others. No compensation should be paid, but in order to share "betterment" proportionately, it is suggested that all property owners within the Park area might become members of a Statutory Company or Trust, shares in the Company being issued to a value proportional to that of the contributed property. Sitting owners or tenants would not be disturbed, and should have the right of nominating their successors. An adequate dividend on the shares might be guaranteed by the Government. If, however, this proposal is considered to be impracticable, an extension of regional planning with a scheme of grants to regional committees might serve.

ACCESS TO MOUNTAINS AND MOORLANDS

However, it is now possible for concerted steps to be taken by Planning Authorities—if they so choose—to initiate schemes through Regional Schemes for the reservation of areas suitable for National Parks and Nature Reserves. There is a healthy and growing increase in rambling and country excursions and an insistent demand for public rights of access to uncultivated areas. That demand can be met, in part at all events, by the provision of trackways and the reservation of belts of Open Spaces under Planning Schemes. The solution of the access to mountains problem may, perhaps, in the end be found in common sense and good will rather than in coercive action.

I myself have never yet sought to climb a mountain and found myself in any way impeded by anyone—but then my appetite for mountain-tops is but moderate and its satisfaction entirely confined to Wales. In Scotland, Yorkshire, and Derbyshire, however, where grouse shooting is still taken seriously as an important local industry, the men with walking staves have found themselves in direct (and sometimes physical) conflict with the men with guns.

As those who enjoy the uplands by merely walking across them out-number those who take their pleasure there by killing grouse by (probably) five thousand to one, it certainly seems a little unfair that the accident of an equally extreme income ratio should give the blood-thirsty affluent the legal right to chivvy all others off his thousands of acres of utterly wild playground. I have no particular objection to moderate grouse-shooting as such;

indeed, for some misguided years it was only as a "gun" that I ever saw the heather at all. But I soon wearied from an excess of shooting—too many birds, too much earnestness and organization, too little leisure and freedom for contemplation and real enjoyment.

HOW THE LAW SHOULD BE REVISED

If the standpoint of those who make and administer our laws were reversed, and it was accepted that "grouse preserving and shooting is only countenanced in so far as reasonable rights of public access are not prejudiced," instead of "No man shall walk where his presence may disturb privately preserved game"—I do not believe that more than a handful of foolish persons intent on "Record Bags" would be any the less happy, whilst the population at large would have a genuine grievance redressed, and a very natural pretext for "civil disobedience" removed. Well-mannered concessions will obviously be required from both sides—but mostly from that which can best afford them.

Co-operation between Councils and Landowners

There can be no doubt that by a wide use of their new powers Councils *may* arrange for the reservation of wide belts of agricultural land or of private Open Spaces. Many of the great landowners are as anxious as any active supporter of the policy of the C.P.R.E., permanently to protect the natural beauty of their estates. They may now do so with profit to themselves, since by reserving large areas of scenically beautiful land they not only ensure

the protection of amenities but lessen the demand for death duties.

It must never be forgotten that planning presupposes co-operation for the benefit of all concerned. It is not a mere matter of hard bargaining. The cost of planning has been exaggerated; but whatever cost there is to the public will be further reduced whenever owners can be persuaded to take the long view and themselves become enlightened planners.

POWERS UNDER THE TOWN-PLANNING ACT

The protection or provision of public and private Open Spaces is, of course, only one of the objects of planning schemes under the recent Act. Section I defines the scope of schemes, which may henceforth be made in respect of *any* land, whether there are or are not buildings thereon, with the objects, *inter alia*, of "preserving existing buildings or other objects of architectural, historic, or artistic interest, and places of natural interest or beauty, and generally of protecting existing amenities whether in urban or rural portions of the area." These broad outlines are largely a legacy from the definition clause in the Rural Amenities Bill of the C.P.R.E.

MEANING OF "AMENITY"

The convenient word "amenity" is nowhere defined, but the "protection" of "amenity" will surely embrace the control of the design, elevation, and materials of permanent buildings of every kind, the protection of view-points and landscapes, of downs and commons, and streams, of ancient buildings worthy of preservation by reason of their antiquity, merit, or historic interest,

the preservation of woodland and groups of trees, of private parks, and all other things which may make the country beautiful or prevent it from being disfigured by reason of uncontrolled development. Amenities, as generally understood, are a national asset, even from an economic point of view, and the call of "Come to England" will become but a mockery if the dignity, interest, and loveliness of the countryside are allowed to perish.

WHAT A TOWN-PLANNING SCHEME INVOLVES

Actually a Town-Planning Scheme consists of (1) a large-scale map on which are indicated certain proposals as to the utilization of land, and (2) a printed code of clauses defining the conditions under which land may be used, together with regulations relating to procedure, etc. The maps are hatched or tinted in various colours to indicate the different uses to which different areas may be put. These areas or *zones* are differentiated as residential, industrial, business, agricultural, and recreational, and the owners of land are debarred from utilizing land for other purposes than those specified. Thus factories and shops are excluded from purely residential areas, and on certain areas building of all kinds may be debarred, as, for instance, on hilltops and river banks, or in wood-lands.

The residential areas are further zoned for density. It is now realized that the overcrowding of houses on land is almost as injurious to public health as the overcrowding of people in dwellings, though we still foolishly aver that "we can't afford to abolish the slums," when in fact it has been proved beyond all question that the one thing we cannot afford is to *keep* them.

On the map the course of new and improved roads is

indicated. These routes proposed relate only to main communications between the several townships. Some of the roads may never be constructed; others may not mature, perhaps, for fifty years. Town-planning is intended to benefit posterity as well as the present generation. The roads shown will probably not be constructed until the need for them is felt, but meanwhile the land over which they are designed to pass is permanently sterilized from building, and the community will be spared the cost of the demolition of buildings which might otherwise be built on the site of the roads.

In laying out their estates, landowners will be obliged to incorporate in their plans those portions of the town-planned roads passing through their property. Moreover, before any estates can be developed, it will be necessary for the owners to get their plans approved, and the Council may require these plans to be co-ordinated with those of adjoining owners.

BACKGROUND OF LAND PLANNING

But Town and Country Planning must be gradual and evolutionary, yet at the same time opportunist. It demands a broad and flexible outlook, not only over the many activities which it has to help in co-ordinating, but also over the range of changing conditions from the present to an imperfectly predictable future. The two opposite dangers, which have wrecked so many plans, are planning on paper only, regardless of what is, and planning from hand to mouth, regardless of what might be. The task of land-planning—doubly difficult in a period of rapid transition—is to sketch lines of development for future years which shall not only be valid in

existing conditions, but still valid when, as we hope, the advance of planning in other activities shall completely have altered the character of the problem. If this background is borne in mind, the general attitude of the planner and the way in which he adapts his attitude to specific circumstances can be better appreciated.

The planner has often to deal with problems which he knows to be simply surface manifestations of deeper underlying troubles, whose solution is usually outside his sphere. In this brief discussion of what can be done in the direction of planning the land in the immediate future it is necessary to exclude many factors which will have to be dealt with concurrently if adequate results are to be secured. One of these factors is finance. The effects upon planning schemes of the rating and derating system, of death duties on agricultural estates, and of such public measures as land valuation, are so far-reaching that a planning policy may be completely nullified by incompatibilities or abrupt reversals in the fiscal field. Even tariffs have had direct consequences in the invasion of foreign-owned factories in Greater London and other areas.

TAXATION AND LAND OWNERSHIP

A second external factor is land ownership. Early this year the Manchester Corporation, in seeking parliamentary powers to enable the planning of a housing estate to be made effective, found itself under the necessity of acquiring a small plot of nine acres which was holding up the scheme. These nine acres had twenty-nine owners in possession. The difficulty of securing common action on such a basis is evident. In the past large landowners, whose estates together covered a substantial part of the

country, could and did plan future development without Government interference. The impoverishment and break-up of large estates has made that system unworkable, and for the present only statutory planning can take its place. But a return to larger units of land management through the pooling of interests or the formation of some type of land trust might again make it possible to limit statutory planning to a broad and general co-ordination.

AGRICULTURAL CHANGES

A third factor is agriculture. What forms of farming, arable and pastoral, intensive and extensive, are to be encouraged? Is British agriculture to expand or decay? These are questions of direct concern to the land-planner.

Again, the general trend and shifting of population has to be considered carefully, especially now that a decline is imminent. Between the census years 1921 and 1931, 615,000 people, a number equivalent to the inhabitants of nearly ten towns the size of Doncaster, moved from the North, Midlands, and West into the fourteen south-eastern English counties. The waste of services and of housing resulting from such huge, uncontrolled migrations is still insufficiently realized, and their repercussions may well wreck the efficiency of planning schemes at either end. A further source of difficulty is the dwindling average size of the family, which came as a shock to many housing authorities after the 1931 census.

THE PLANNER IS CRITICIZED

Further, there is the question of the selection, training, and organization of land-planners themselves, many of whom recognize the justice of some of the criticisms

lately levelled against them both from within their own ranks and from outside sources, as for example from Parliament. If planning powers are to be so used as to secure better living conditions than could be obtained without them, it is essential that the outlook and technique of the planners themselves should keep well abreast of the many and exacting problems with which they must deal. Improved status for the local government service with which the town and country planner is associated would raise standards all round.

All these difficulties, and more, have to be appreciated as a preliminary to any useful discussion of the immediate steps in town and country planning. The situation is changing with kaleidoscopic rapidity, and only a firm grasp of fundamentals can enable action to be taken with the sureness and speed which is now demanded.

HOW FAR PAPER-PLANNING EXTENDS

Disregarding for the present the qualitative aspect of planning, and looking at the subject on a purely quantitative basis, we find that of the 37,327,000 acres of land in England and Wales, nearly 9½ millions—that is, about a quarter—were covered by preliminary resolutions to plan at the time when the Town and Country Planning Act came into force on April 1, 1933. But many of these resolutions had been passed years ago without ever being followed up. For example, some thirty districts which obtained authority to plan before 1919 have not yet got any further. At the end of 1932 it was calculated that, if the existing rate of progress could be speeded up from two to ten times, the whole country would be covered by resolutions to plan in another

fifteen years, and by preliminary statements of plans submitted in thirty years—that is, by 1962. Then it would take another twenty years, until 1982, for the Minister of Health to approve all the preliminary statements. Within two hundred years actual schemes would have been submitted, and the final stage of approval of schemes covering the whole country would be complete in four hundred years—that is, by A.D. 2333.

AN ABSURDLY SLOW ADVANCE

Without wishing to belittle the efforts hitherto made, it is arguable that this rate of progress is not altogether satisfactory. During the past few months, it is true, there has been a considerable spurt, mainly through the anxiety of local authorities to select their areas while the old Act still allowed freedom from Whitehall intervention. At April 1, 1933, the total acreage under finally approved schemes only amounted to 152,000 acres, an area slightly larger than the Isle of Man, and about 1-250th of the whole country. It is true that advisory surveys and plans cover a good deal of additional ground, but their value at the moment is that of propaganda rather than of *faits accomplis*, for they are not necessarily agreed by the interests concerned, nor have they executive force.

FOUR LINES OF ATTACK

Looking at this formidable situation, it is possible to distinguish four immediate lines of attack which, if all pursued simultaneously and with energy, promise fairly adequate results. These four lines are, first, to take advantage of the new Act in every possible way for speeding up under Ministerial pressure the making and approval

of local plans in all areas; secondly, to press on with the organization of as many as possible of the separate interests affected in the interests of constructive instead of obstructive ends, so that the work of getting agreement can be simplified and the implementing of approved plans facilitated; thirdly, to gather the tangled threads of existing survey and information agencies into the orderly nucleus of a clearing house for information and statistics, and from this to develop a headquarters which will think and act on a national scale; and, finally, to reorganize the administrative system, central and local, in accordance with the new conception of the sphere of government and the new practical demands of a country in course of transition towards a planned economy. To summarize the position: Without a detailed attack, a national plan must be academic; without the larger outlook, detailed plans will clash and thwart one another; without reconstruction of the political and economic machine, neither can become a living force. The position would be simple if planning could be imposed from above, but this is not feasible or desirable either from a political or a planning point of view. The task is to graft planning by agreement and by gradual stages into a complex living organism which is already in part planned, but in part given over to anarchy.

WHAT THE NEW ACT CAN DO

The first line of attack is the use of the Town and Country Planning Act as an instrument for enormously speeding up the processes of planning area by area. In spite of the shortcomings and restrictions of the Act, which are widely known, it does unquestionably permit

a substantial advance, provided it is vigorously, intelligently, and persuasively used under a strong lead from the Minister. There is no reason why, with little or no amendment, it should not be employed to secure the planning, in more or less detail, of every acre of England and Wales within the next five years. But, if such a programme is to be practicable, certain steps must be taken at once. A definite objective must be formulated and broken up into convenient stages, each with a provisional time limit attached to it. For example, April 1, 1935, might be fixed now as the final date by which all resolutions to plan must have been made and approved, and April 1, 1938, for the completion of the final stage, allowing the normal three years for the five stages to be put through. The fact that five-year programmes have already been demanded by the Ministry for the related and equally formidable task of slum clearance is an indication that an acceleration of this order should not be impossible. But the acceleration does involve a temporary reinforcement of the staff of the Town-Planning Department of the Ministry of Health, whose present personnel, although able and enthusiastic, could not possibly keep abreast of such a task. This Department alone possesses the necessary information, authority, and technique to tackle the job in the circumstances which have to be taken for granted. But there has already been delay in interpreting the new Act, and it is essential that planning should not be damped down by congestion at the Ministry, which ought to be setting the pace by a campaign of education and persuasion, in which the Council for the Preservation of Rural England and other non-official bodies should be enlisted.

LOCAL AUTHORITIES ON TRIAL

Under the Town and Country Planning Act the local authorities will have a last chance themselves to draw up and administer plans. The existing local authorities are on trial. That the smaller of them individually are unfit for the task is fairly evident, and there can be no doubt that the county authorities will need to initiate, support, and supervise schemes for most of the rural and some of the urban districts within their areas. County advisory committees, representing all authorities and interests, may perform an important service at this stage in the stimulation and co-ordination of planning, and through their agency the still vigorous pride of county may be directed to constructive ends.

For executive purposes the county will usually require to be divided into groups of local authorities. In case of default by the smaller of these authorities, the county should be ready to intervene, and in the last resort the Minister has powers of imposing his own plans. While these powers will be useful in rounding off areas and dealing with recalcitrant minorities, their employment, except as a last resort, would indicate a failure of the technical, financial, and persuasive instruments on which the Minister ought normally to be able to rely. As his powers in this respect are hedged about by delaying limitations, it is possible that a minor amendment of the law may soon be necessary.

NECESSITY TO PLAN ALL AREAS

The Act does not provide for planning of static areas, except those of natural interest or beauty, but it is ques-

tionable whether any such areas really exist anywhere in England under the present transitional conditions. It is regrettable, but beyond dispute, that there are plenty of people determined to proceed with misdevelopment wherever they can do so with profit, for just so long as it is allowed. To plan some areas without planning others is simply to divert their anti-social activities to fields which had previously escaped, and so to spread the damage even more widely than if no plans had been made. This is not simply a question of amenities, important as these are.

SUBURB *v.* FARM

Take the example of Surrey, which has an administrative area of approximately 450,000 acres. Between 1921 and 1931 the population of Surrey increased by 210,000, but in the same period approximately 43,000 acres, or 9·5 per cent of the surface, was diverted from agricultural to residential and other uses. In a small country, to absorb farmland for building at this extremely low rate of five persons to the acre is an expensive luxury, and investigation shows that the waste of land assets through haphazard development is out of all proportion to the population provided for, even if the provision were itself satisfactory.

Here the second line of attack, the organization of affected interests, becomes necessary. No one has consulted the farmer, or agricultural research worker, before converting many of the richest acres in Greater London from intensive cultivation to thin and patchy residential development. This is true not only where blind speculation has been the dominant motive force, but even in

such cases as the Becontree Estate at Dagenham, which is in many respects a highly planned community. Dagenham, in fact, provides many warnings of the pitfalls of partial planning. Its landlord is the London County Council, which reserves the houses primarily for workers in London. But the site is in Essex, and the rating and planning authority is, therefore, wrapped up in the Essex, not the London, administration.

CONFUSION IN SOUTH-EAST ESSEX

At the same time, this part of the Lower Thames has been selected by great and internally carefully planned industrial units, such as Ford (motors) and Bata (shoes), whose workers must presumably find housing elsewhere than in Dagenham. A large power station has been erected by one electricity authority at Barking, and a multiplicity of pylons by another, a service aerodrome is operated by the Royal Air Force, and a little lower down at Tilbury the Port of London Authority is developing a large passenger seaport. The Ministry of Transport has a scheme, which has temporarily been postponed, for a road tunnel under the Thames in this part of Essex, which will form a new trunk route for south-eastern England, avoiding London. A private aerodrome also within a few miles has lately inaugurated a regular service to Paris.

DANGERS OF "COMPARTMENTAL" PLANNING

The list of these activities, many at least of which are in themselves most efficiently carried on, might be further extended. Just how much, in the absence of a directing plan, they will get in each other's way it is impossible

to predict, but all would have gained enormously had their location and growth been decided upon with reference to one another and to the community as a whole. It is particularly worth observing that it is not uncontrolled private enterprise which is responsible for this chaotic and wasteful development. On the contrary, many of the bodies concerned are public or semi-public authorities, able to take broad and long views.

PLANNING IN COMPARTMENTS

But their planning has been mainly compartmental, so that the efficiency of almost all has been compromised by factors outside their separate control.

In some cases the whole country, and in others large parts of it, are coming under the direction of authorities for transport by rail, by road, by inland water, by sea, and air; of power authorities concerned with coal, oil, gas, and electricity; of drainage, water supply, forestry, communications, and innumerable other authorities all showing an increasing tendency to plan within their own fields, but devoid of machinery for co-ordinating their actions. The struggle of the individual against authority in general is matched by the struggle of one authority against another.

In this conflict lies the opportunity for developing in conjunction with the local authorities a national Master Plan. The bodies which already from necessity take a national view within their own field give a foundation for the beginnings of co-ordination on a national scale. To reduce the number of conflicting authorities to a practical minimum, and to ensure that all substantial

interests are adequately represented by a body able to speak on their behalf, are essential steps.

A SURVEY NEVER ENDS

A further essential is to lose no time in undertaking the co-ordination, in accessible and usable form, of the immense mass of survey material, maps, and information which has been accumulated within the various compartments. A national survey of the use of land is indispensable to a national plan. But such a survey can never finish. It must be continuous, and continuously revised, if it is to retain its value. This means that it should not be thought of necessarily or wholly as a new task which has to be begun from the beginning. On the contrary, what is needed is the transformation of the rich material that already exists to serve the new needs of a planned economy, the determination of the gaps which have to be filled, and the filling of these gaps by accumulating the information which is of the greatest immediate practical value.

NECESSITY OF CO-ORDINATED INFORMATION

To take a familiar example, a great mass of material relating to industry and employment has already been collected by the State. But the Census of Population, issued every decade by the Registrar-General, uses a different classification of occupations from the Census of Production, taken at very irregular intervals by the Board of Trade; while the Ministry of Labour, which issues information about employment, conflicts with both. Factories are reported on by the Home Office, but buildings in general are enumerated by categories in the Census of Population; new buildings assessed for

income tax for the first time are the concern of the Commissioners of Inland Revenue, and the complex mass of information collected by local authorities in the process of rating and derating goes to the Ministry of Health. The cost of buildings for which plans have been approved by local authorities is assessed by the Ministry of Labour, while housing progress is reported by the Ministry of Health. When essential facts are needed about, say, building, it is often impossible to ascertain them, because not only the collection but the analysis of statistics is incidental to various administrative functions which do not call for a view of building as a whole. At present it is no one's business to obtain information in any case in which it is not required for one of these *ad hoc* divisions, or to see that it is made available.

As examples of gaps in the existing survey of the United Kingdom, the absence of any systematic and comprehensive information on the slum problem, on national water-supply resources, on transport services as a whole, on sewage, on coast protection, on land drainage, or on the extent of land potentially suitable for agriculture of various types may serve to indicate present shortcomings. The last is particularly serious. Such data are obviously relevant to town and country planning, and in their absence only sketchy and temporary plans can be produced.

NEED FOR NEW MACHINERY

Machinery for the collection and analysis of such information is urgently necessary, and the prime requirement of the moment is a general objective stocktaking within each of the separate compartments which have been mentioned. Once this stocktaking has been under-

taken, the need for a central directive organization and the willingness to support it are certain to emerge. To make the transition period as brief as possible is within the power of those at present dealing piecemeal with what must, *eventually*, be dealt with as a whole.

CHAPTER IX

PRINCIPLES OF TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING

by
G. M. BOUMPHREY

"*Town and Country Planning*, with the object of maintaining and improving public amenities, preserving the wild places, safeguarding the beauty of the country-side, and securing these for the enjoyment of all. Immediate steps to this end would include—

- (a) Provision of National Parks.
- (b) Passage into law of proposals such as those contained in 'The Access to Mountains and Moorlands Bill.'
- (c) Slum Clearance."

The Basis of the Federation of Progressive Societies and Individuals.

CHAPTER IX

PRINCIPLES OF TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING

CONTEMPORARY EFFORTS AND ADVICES

During the past few years a great many people have noticed with dismay that something is going wrong with our countryside. During the same period even more people have come to realize that something is going wrong with our towns—if only so far as the traffic problem is concerned. (The efforts of a fanatical minority to secure better living conditions for the poorer classes date from considerably earlier.)

The country-lovers, keen but for the most part romantic and woolly-witted, have managed to rescue a few “beauty-spots” (was ever greater condemnation of a people’s way of thinking than the growing use—in a country such as ours—of this loathsome hyphenated phrase?), and have even, being frequently not without influence, secured the passage into law of several Bills designed, but unlikely, to preserve the countryside. Those whose duty it is to control the traffic have tried a number of panicky expedients, few of which have done much good under present conditions, and none of which will prevail in the conditions looming immediately ahead of us.

Social reformers have so far succeeded in their efforts as to have foisted upon our legislators and local authorities (and, indeed, upon most of us) the garden-city ideal of separate houses, each with a garden round at least

three of its sides, as a result of which our towns are now surrounded by an ever-widening area of little houses, so ghastly in their cumulative effect that even architects (who can rarely see beyond the confines of their drawing-boards) are being moved to protest, while the country-lovers cry aloud that there will soon be no true country left for them to love. Finally, the public conscience has now been awakened to a degree which makes probable the rebuilding of at least a substantial proportion of our slums within the next few years; so that in the middles of these overgrown towns, hopelessly out of reach of real country, we shall continue to house that very part of our population which stands in greatest need of cheap and easy access to country air.

THE MUDDLE AND ITS SOLVERS

If the whole business cannot accurately be termed a vicious circle, it is at least a ghastly muddle, and a muddle that will soon get very much worse. The volume of traffic in London has almost doubled in the last five years; what if it should redouble in the next? The town itself sprawls out with rare gaps from Brighton to St. Albans, and from Maidenhead to the east coast. Is this process to continue indefinitely? Throughout England it is only the most isolated districts that are still untouched, and few measures are being taken to protect them unless they are scheduled as official beauty-spots.

It is time to point out that the only way to save the country is by making the towns fit to live in. This can only be done by solving incidentally such problems as those of traffic and slums, and by reducing the present absurd disproportion between income and dwelling expenses.

To appreciate the magnitude of the whole question is to be bitterly amused at the ineptitude of the efforts now being made to solve it. Are unpleasant and un-economical little houses any the better for being pushed together in clots instead of being strung out in ribbons? Or will the countryside be saved by the scheduling and preservation of a few picked spots, to be looked at like exhibits in a museum? Where are the men of proved good taste to form the panels and advisory committees in whom such great powers are to be vested? Shall we look for them among architects? Or among town councillors? How long will "one-ways" and "roundabouts" or the occasional setting back of a building-line avail against an enormously increased flow of traffic through streets that are already unbearably congested? It is obvious that more drastic steps will have to be taken, and it will be cheaper to take them now than to wait until they are forced upon us.

THE ENEMIES IN THE FIELD

When London was burnt down in the Great Fire, she was fortunate enough to possess in Wren an architect capable of taking the fullest advantage of a unique opportunity. But Wren's plans for a new London were brought to nothing by the selfishness and lack of foresight of the city merchants. To-day, even the most bigoted and conservative antique-lover will agree that this should not have been allowed to happen. Yet precisely the same narrow-mindedness as that which defeated Wren is still at work, preventing us from solving our difficulties in a rational manner. There are few material obstacles in our way—certainly nothing which it is beyond the powers of engineers and architects to solve: the real

obstacles are in men's minds, and these are far harder to deal with. The first, ignorance of the true possibilities, it is the aim of this article to lighten; the second, conservatism, I shall belabour whenever opportunity offers; and the third, selfishness, must be left to take care of itself, although I cannot refrain from pointing out that most of us are connected in one way or another with those nebulous bodies, "vested interests," which are the arch-villains of this particular piece.

To some readers it may presently appear that, of several evils, I am advocating if not the worst, at least not the best; and it must, therefore, be premised that an acceptance of what follows implies some change of ideals. In order to prepare the ground for this, it will be well to examine the events which have resulted in the formation of our present ideals, and see whether these ideals are, in the circumstances of life to-day, appropriate.

EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY ATTITUDE TO NATURE

From earliest times man has been proud of his towns as symbols of his progress in the fight against Nature; they represented, first, security, and, later, culture. The country was there to be used; it had its beauties, of course, for those with eyes to see them; but in the main it represented the outposts of Nature, to be subjugated one by one. Wild, untamed country was frankly loathed. This attitude persisted (so far as England is concerned) well into the eighteenth century. Two quotations will serve to illustrate this. The first from the *Gentleman's Magazine* of 1761:

Few are perhaps acquainted with that dreary part of Westmoreland which borders Yorkshire. Indeed its forbidding

aspect, composed of lofty mountains, whose craggy summits seem formed of rocks thrown together by the hand of discord, and frightful deserts, laid waste by the piercing storms of the north, tend to extinguish curiosity and prevent travellers from seeking the recesses of a country, which promise only labour and fatigue. The roads, or rather paths, between the mountains that lead into those sequestered retreats are often frightful beyond description. . . . Not a shrub nor blade of grass enlivens the prospect: the whole side of the mountain appearing as if blasted by lightning, and the place where black despair has fixed her dire abode.

And this from Johnson in 1775:

What is not heath is nakedness, a little diversified by now and then a stream rushing down the steep. An eye accustomed to flowery pastures and waving harvests is astonished and repelled by this wide extent of hopeless sterility. The appearance is that of matter incapable of form or usefulness, dismissed by nature from her care and disinherited of her favours, left in its original elemental state or quickened only with one sullen power of useless vegetation. It will readily occur that this uniformity of barrenness can afford very little amusement to the traveller: that it is easy to sit at home and conceive rocks and heath and waterfalls; and that these journeys are useless labours which neither impregnate the imagination nor enlarge the understanding.

THE BEAUTIFYING OF ENGLAND

There is little here of the modern hiker's point of view. The town was the thing that mattered; the country was well enough when it had been disciplined and turned to man's requirements. Love of nature in the rough simply did not exist. And here it is well to point out the extreme artificiality of the average English countryside. That beauty which is freely admitted by English and

foreigners alike to be unrivalled throughout the world in its own particular way is by no means the work of Nature: it is the result of generations of careful and knowledgeable work—work that was at first mainly utilitarian in its aim, but later was undertaken for the express purpose of creating the beauty which we to-day are so ruthlessly destroying. Those of us who were alive in the concluding years of the last century probably saw the beauty of England at its highest point—higher than it had ever been before, higher—God knows!—than it can be again for many a decade.

The conscious beautifying of the English countryside may be said to have started in 1664 with the publication of *Sylva*, by John Evelyn, the diarist. This book, which ran through many editions and was the forerunner of whole libraries of similar works, awakened England to the possibilities of landscape-gardening on a large scale. There was no thought of “preserving the beauties of nature”; but there was a widespread enthusiasm for creating with real forms the painted landscapes of such men as Claude, Salvator Rosa, and Lorraine. All over England trees were planted with a careful foreknowledge of the effect they would give when mature. The English countryside, as we know it, was manufactured.

Now it is past its prime. The great trees are falling or being cut down—and little is done to replace them. The vistas are blocked—and few have eyes to see what has been lost. Instead, we rely on the comfortable fallacy that Nature can look after the country (a legacy of the Victorian belief in the disposition of all creation to man's express advantage) and trust blindly to her hand for the healing of the scars we inflict.

THE ROMANTICIZING OF NATURE

By 1850 the wave of country-planning was spent, and the industrial age, with its lust for money-making, was running up towns of a hideousness such as the world had never seen. Beauty, that word so often on the tongues and almost always in the minds of the Georgians, was no longer mentioned or considered by respectable persons. To-day the plain man still feels as uncomfortable at the sound of it as at the mention of God.

By the end of the century the Englishman's attitude towards the country had reached its latest, its contemporary phase; he had begun to romanticize it. In sheer reaction from the horror that was now the town, he turned to the country and found there something that he could love. Old fears of the power of Nature were blotted out by the consciousness of Victorian achievement, and aversion for the wild was replaced by sentimental affection. 1879 saw the birth of the garden-city ideal at Bournville. It was followed, a few years later, by Port Sunlight; and, finally, in 1898, it found its voice in the publication of *To-morrow*, by Ebenezer Howard. The towns were (he rightly declared) evil: we must get "back to the land." Every man should live in a house with garden round at least three sides of it, in the which he could grow food enough for his own family and—this was, in fact, the original idea—something extra to sell.

THE GARDEN CITY IDEAL

The book exercised an immense influence over the whole civilized world. To-day we are still bemused by the foggy ideals it exuded, though we can see with

hideous clarity the evils they have led to: the towns are but little better, the country is immeasurably worse.

To some extent the problems confronting Howard have changed in ways that he could not have foreseen. In the main, however, we are still paying the penalty for his bad thinking, and his thinking is still the thinking of more than ninety-nine per cent of the population to-day. We must, it is clear, have a new ideal, the ideal of "Saving the country by making the towns fit to live in." Howard inveighed against the town chiefly because of its smoke, fog, bad air, slums, long working-hours, and gin-palaces. The last two are now seen to have been no more inherent in town life than is good taste in town councillors. Almost, one might have expected Howard to have seen this for himself.

But are not the other evils on precisely the same plane? Must slums and bad air continue to pollute our towns? Apparently the view of Authority is that they must, since it has decided that the country (or the nearest travesty of it that can be attained) is the proper dwelling-place for man, even though the real country be destroyed or put hopelessly out of reach in the effort to attain it. We can only infer that the town is an evil which must be endured—and in this evil, of course, a mass of people must continue to live! Clearly, our thinking has improved but little since Howard's day.

Thus put, the main fallacy of the garden-city ideal is clear; but it remains to be shown on what other grounds it can be indicted. These are (i) Inconvenience, (ii) Expense, and (iii) Aesthetics. I mention the last with some diffidence, well knowing that it is not a point that can be expected to carry any weight in a practical dis-

cussion. It will not be treated at any length, and it can wait till the end.

DEFECTS OF THE IDEAL

(i) The chief inconvenience of the garden-city (or the garden-city type of building such as sprawls along our arterial roads) lies in the amount of space it takes up. This means that its inhabitants have further to travel to and from work, shops, amusements, and real country. It also widens the space that has to be traversed by town-dwellers in search of the country.

(ii) Expense is heightened both by fares for these greater distances, and also by the uneconomic construction and maintenance of the houses themselves. It is clearly more expensive to build houses singly or in pairs than to group them in blocks, thus sharing roofs and walls, and enormously reducing the cost of sanitary and heating installations. For instance, think of the time, labour, and fuel that is wasted in running dozens of separate little boilers instead of one large plant for all.

Points such as these will be so readily admitted that it is waste of time to elaborate and extend them. Instead, I shall turn to the arguments that will be advanced in opposition.

“The garden-city type of development gives the healthiest living conditions.” No one will deny that the garden-city is healthier than the average town; but it is the modern, rational town, and not the average town of to-day that is being put forward here as an alternative. The garden-city standard of twelve houses to the acre was originally reached because it offered the minimum garden area capable of supplying the householder with

the surplus of garden produce contemplated by Mr. Howard; it was never meant to be taken as indicating the maximum concentration of houses compatible with optimum health conditions. Yet that is what it has now become in the eyes of various Ministries, local authorities, panels, and inspectors all over the country. Such a belief never has been and never can be justified. Actually, it can be shown that a concentration of twenty or even thirty houses to the acre may be every bit as healthy, if aspect, ventilation, and environment (three factors far more important than space) be taken into proper consideration.

PRIVACY AND THE ENGLISHMAN'S CASTLE

Next will arise the old cry, "The Englishman's home is his castle. He won't live in a flat: he likes privacy," and "A man ought to have a bit of garden." There is no doubt that, other things being equal, most Englishmen do prefer a house to a flat. But the point is that in this case other things are so very far from being equal. If the choice lies between house and flat in similar urban surroundings, he will usually choose the house; but give him the chance of a flat surrounded by acres of open park-land, with all the conveniences that can and should be given in such buildings (but so rarely are), within easy reach of his work and of the open country, and at about one-third of the rent for the house, and I suggest that there is no doubt he will take the flat.

The only loss of privacy is that involved in the use of a common lift instead of walking up a short front path (which is probably overlooked from both sides and the road in front). Meanwhile his wife can throw away as

unnecessary the net curtains used in most small houses to screen the front rooms from the gaze of passers-by: no other building will be near enough to disturb her privacy. If he has fears that the sound of pianos or wireless will penetrate his walls from neighbouring flats, he may disregard them: modern materials in the hands of those who can use them make such disturbance impossible. Even a garden is not impracticable, if some such plan as Le Corbusier's cellular system with its "hanging gardens" be adopted.

AND HIS GARDEN

But is it, in fact, the case that almost every man *wants* a garden of his own? At the beginning of the garden-city era most men probably did. But to-day the motor-car, the cinema, wireless, and a host of other distractions unknown at that time claim our attention. The keen gardener is becoming rarer. He still exists in considerable numbers, as a journey or two in a suburban train will prove; but just as surely will his relative rarity be shown by an examination of the small gardens along any arterial road. Out of every ten, three will be more or less neglected, six will be laid out so as to require the absolute minimum of upkeep, and one only will show the signs of enthusiastic care. There will always be enough gardens for the born gardeners; but must the rest of us continue to pay the present heavy price to nurse the fallacy of their abundance?

LACK OF BEAUTY IN GARDEN CITIES

Aesthetics. It requires some hardihood to introduce aesthetics when the very word beauty is suspect in any ordinary conversation, and when almost any love of

beauty left is based on a romantic love of the past. It is quite possible that relatively few people alive to-day have discovered that garden-cities—even the most favourable examples—are ridiculously ugly. From the self-consciousness of Hampstead Garden Suburb to the ineptitudes of Welwyn Garden City, they are unworthy to be mentioned on the same page as the word beauty.

Without going into technicalities it may be said that the reason for this lack of beauty is the impossibility of making a decent architectural composition out of a number of small units set widely apart, like matchboxes on a billiard-table. Questions of scale make some form of grouping essential however lavish may be the use of trees (which take thirty years to attain a sufficient height) as links. It is just this grouping which the garden-city ideal forbids. Instead of taking pride in man's conquest of Nature and expressing it in our domestic architecture, we are playing a game of make-believe with the past—pretending that we are still savages living in grass huts. It is just our keenest town-planners and country-lovers who are most in love (openly or not—probably not, of late, if they are architects) with thatched roofs, half-timbered work, and similar anachronisms. The whole country is, indeed, so obsessed by an irrational love of the past that it is matter for no surprise that we are unable to accept a decent modern architecture—and we pay for our folly an unrealized amount in cash, convenience, and health.

LOOKING TO THE PAST

We have traced now in some detail the change in men's feelings towards the country from fear to sentimental love,

so that, true to Wilde, they now “kill the thing they love.” We have seen, too, that the modern ambition to live in the country represents a very recent change in ideals, not yet a century old. The choice before us is quite simple: either the present process must continue and the countryside, so much beloved by all, so much needed by all for health and recreation, be ruined; or we must replace that ideal with another.

Man is so constituted that he cannot stand still and be content with the present. Either he must look to the future and climb strenuously towards it, or he must look—and slip—towards the past. At the present time we in England are suffering from a very bad attack of looking to the past. This may be said to date, so far as concerns our subject here, from William Morris and the “hand-craftsman” school. Appalled by the dirt and ugliness created by the growing use of machinery, these men turned their eyes to the past and, instead of looking forward to see how the machine might be pressed into the service of beauty, they denounced it outright as evil. They praised the antique and the hand-made, and themselves made beautiful things by hand. All the forces of reaction were on their side, and the most intelligent and sensitive among their countrymen fell in with their views.

We can see now their mistake: had they looked forward and sought for beauty among the irresistible forces which were working in the matrix of their times, there is no knowing what transformation they might have wrought in the appearance of almost everything in this country. Instead, we realize that so far as design and the mere appreciation of beauty are concerned, we are only just emerging (if emerging we are) from a period of

extreme decadence. To-day the whole population looks on beauty as a romantic thing belonging to the past. Our architects are trained to believe an old-fashioned style of building (with, of course, "modern conveniences") the most beautiful that can be produced. Our furniture-designers know that they can never make a chair to be judged equal to Chippendale's; our potters go on faithfully copying or merely aping the designs that had life and aptness (and so beauty) in their grandfathers' days. Everywhere among creators, producers, and purchasers there is this infatuation for the products of other days, this cynical indifference to those of our own. Is it to be wondered at that we lack the urge and inspiration to create anything worthy of the present?

NEED FOR NEW IDEALS

This is the thing that must be changed. Country life, except for the relatively few, is sentimental and static. Town life, as it could, as it can be, is dynamic and inspiring. Engineers and architects are straining at the leash; they have the knowledge and the will to build miracles of cities—miracles of cheapness and comfort and beauty—and they are held back by stultifying restrictions based on worship of the past, greed, and lack of vision. In these cities modern man could live to the full the modern life for which he is fitted, and in them he would find the inspiration that is so lacking in his surroundings to-day. Instead of dragging home with pride a Tudor table, of which one leg is genuinely old timber, he would buy each latest product with the same keenness he now shows towards the new season's motor-car. How far such a change might ease the question of over-production I

shall leave the economists to decide. At any rate, it would imply the birth of a new-old spirit—the spirit that was most alive, perhaps, in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries: pride in the day's achievement and eager excitement about the morrow's.

A great art can only be born out of an adventurous spirit. Especially is this true of architecture, which reflects more faithfully than any other art the thoughts and outlook, as well as the manner of living, of the whole people. It is hopeless to expect valuable results from restrictions wielded by panels of wrongly-educated architects, still less of town or borough councillors. When the country has found an ideal, it will cease to concentrate on the prevention of bad things, and will concentrate on the doing of good ones. The days of the great landowners (who were generally men of taste) are over. Democracy must be taught the principles of aesthetics; but these principles must be suited to the kind of life it wishes to lead—or would wish to lead, if it had any knowledge of the possibilities. The ground lies open, ready for the seed—cluttered up, perhaps, with the weeds of wrong ideas, and partially exhausted by the growth of old crops, but ready enough to respond to a new sowing in the right rotation. There is no lack of evidence to show what type of seed it needs. Those industries which have best weathered the slump are those modern ones in closest touch with modern life: motor-cars, aeroplanes, and wireless. Those which have fared worst are those most closely linked with the past: building, agriculture, and the antique trade, of which the two former are hampered by their out-of-date technique, in spite of the demand for their products. I saw at a cinema the other night a

film called "Contact," a film to popularize aviation. It was full of picturesque shots of romantic country all over the world. But the parts which really moved the audience were pictures showing the actual making and assembling of the aeroplanes—a hundred identical inlet valves in a rack, cylinders being bored, propellers shaped, engines tested. The old standards of beauty are going, and are being replaced by new.

THE TOWN OF TO-MORROW

I said at the beginning of this article that the chief obstacles in the way of achieving towns worthy of to-day (and therefore capable of saving themselves and the countryside) were in men's heads; and, consequently, I have devoted most space to a consideration of ideas and ideals. But my task would be only half done if I gave no indication of the way in which the physical and financial obstacles can be removed. We will examine the "City of To-morrow," so far as the best brains of to-day have been able to see it.

In the first place, it will be utterly unlike the town of to-day. Buildings will occupy a relatively small part of the ground. In the "Voisin Plan" for rebuilding the centre of Paris,¹ Le Corbusier reckoned on using a mere 5 to 15 per cent of the total area for his buildings, which yet could accommodate four times the number of people at present housed on the site. The remaining area would be laid out as parks, gardens, playgrounds, and traffic arteries. Although this particular plan envisaged the

¹ A plan drawn up by Le Corbusier and exhibited at the Paris Exposition of 1925. Known as the Voisin Plan, because M. Voisin was responsible for financing the necessary research.

construction of sixty-story skyscrapers, to be used for business purposes only, the blocks of *dwellings* in no cases exceeded 125 feet—about the height of our new blocks of flats in Park Lane—and the skyscraper should not, therefore, be regarded as the only possible solution to the problem.

What is essential is a greater concentration of population per unit area, with a consequent release of the bulk of the ground (at least 85 per cent) for open spaces. Not only does this give complete freedom from the danger of being overlooked to every building; it provides space for roads on which even the vastly greater traffic of the future will appear negligible; it gives opportunities for laying out gardens and parks on a truly magnificent scale, and it sweeps away the slum.

One can imagine the effect of seeing such a city—the acres of green, broken here and there by sheets of water or playing-fields, the great trees rising to their full country heights, and here and there among them lovely buildings in white and crystal, shining in the clear air.

These things are not dreams: they are easily realizable possibilities. At this moment there are at least twenty men in Europe—perhaps four in England—who could make them realities. Rebuilt like this, London could shrink to a third of its size and yet increase its capacity. The country could be brought back to within something like reasonable reach of even this hypertrophied city.

THE DEVELOPMENT WHICH IS PRACTICABLE

That is what could be. Let us see what can be, for even the most drastic rationalist would not hope for such a complete extirpation of ancestor-worship as would be

needed to realize such a plan. Many compromises will inevitably have to be made, compromises with public sentiment no less than with private interests. Here we can at least affirm in which direction development should proceed.

THE SIZE OF TOWNS

In the first place, London, or any town with more than, say, half a million inhabitants, is far too large. There is a point beyond which the cost of public services appears to increase with any further increase in the population (London costs of administration average 63s. 9d. per head, as against 48s. 6d. in the next highest borough), and this critical point appears to lie in the region of from 30,000 to 50,000. Again, a town large enough to accommodate more than about 150,000 people in conditions of maximum health (or half that number by garden-city standards) tends to become so large as to put the real open country out of easy walking distance of those of its inhabitants who are too poor to afford transport. I make this point because it seems to me obvious that even the most generous supply of urban parks, gardens, and playing-fields does not atone for the absence of the real country.

Thirdly, a population of 100,000 or so provides an adequate labour pool for a sufficient number of different industries, whose seasonal fluctuations may be expected to cancel each other out to some extent and so keep unemployment at a low figure.

We see, therefore, that from several points of view the ideal to be aimed at is a series of towns of roughly 100,000 inhabitants. These must be situated far enough apart

to avoid any danger of coalescence, yet close enough to be able to derive the benefits of a certain interdependence. Ten miles would appear to be about the optimum distance, varying roughly with the size of the central town. Every effort must be made to reduce the size of the present great centres, both by rebuilding on the lines indicated (a greater concentration of dwellings, with a subsequent release of ground for open spaces) and by inducing whole industries, with their allies and employees, to move out to satellite towns. The development of motor transport makes this latter process far easier than it would have been a few years ago.

THE TOWN AS A SOURCE OF PRIDE

The original nuclear towns will retain much of their old importance as nuclei of cultural influence, and as centres for the more elaborate entertainments and for certain necessarily local activities. As they gradually assume the character of modern rational towns, those whose work lies in them will be attracted back to them as places fit to live in, and the present absurd rush, twice daily, to and from a common centre, with its unnecessary friction, waste, and congestion, will cease. The dormitory town and the suburb will dwindle out of existence. From this we may hope to see another good result: the revival of English corporate life. A town 75 per cent of whose inhabitants are sucked away each morning and returned, tired out, at night, can no more be expected to exhibit vitality than a man who has just given a pint of blood for transfusion. Is it any wonder that its inhabitants show little pride or interest in it, but prefer to attach themselves listlessly and parasitically to the centre that

gives them their bread and margarine? Is it any wonder that most local councils are composed not of civic-minded men, but of those with axes to grind, or in search of a spurious superiority? In a self-contained town, the main interests of whose inhabitants lie within its boundaries, we may expect to see a regrowth of that spirit of citizenship which has been, on the whole, a beneficent feature of English life in the past. We may even see a development of pride in the beauty of the place, when beauty becomes once more a thing understood, appreciated, and to be spoken of freely one man with another. Gone will be the spattering of nasty, pseudo-hygienic little houses, each weakly proclaiming its semi-detachment, and their places will be taken by groups of dwellings, not ashamed to stand together for the attainment of beauty, symbols of that co-operation by which man has conquered Nature.

CAN WE AFFORD IT?

And the cost? Here general opinion is badly at fault. It forgets to take into consideration the cost of things as they are. An increase of two miles an hour in the average speed of their buses would save what was lately the London General Omnibus Company the sum of £1,300,000 a year. The Ministry of Transport estimates the cost of traffic delay at one point alone in London as £1,000 a day. What must be the aggregate cost of all the other delays at all the other points to all the other users? And what the cost in life and limb? Fog in London costs £1,300,000 a year. Manchester pays £1,000,000 for its smoke, two-thirds of which is due to the domestic fire. Beyond these easily ascertainable figures what must be the cost in ill-health, mental and physical, of existence in

London or any of our big towns. "It is generally admitted that the third generation to live in a town is sterile"!¹

Confronted with figures such as these, can we go on pretending that we cannot afford to rebuild? Of course, slum-rebuilding is expensive, on the assumption that we rebuild only in small patches, leaving the surrounding district almost as completely a slum area as when we began. The sweeping away of the slum district where Kingsway now runs was criticized as expensive folly; but the scheme paid off every penny of its cost far sooner than was estimated, and has been producing large dividends ever since. Even at our present rate of rebuilding, London will have been rebuilt within a century. Is it to be no better then than now? The "Voisin Plan" was shown to be financially sound. There is no doubt that London and our other big towns could be rebuilt at a profit estimable in figures, but inestimable in health and happiness. Building costs can be reduced by as much as four-fifths provided that modern rational methods of construction are adopted. Rents can be reduced to a fraction of their present levels; hours of useless travel and delay can be eliminated, and the country, threatened no longer by hosts of disgruntled town-dwellers, can be nursed back to something like its old beauty and brought within the reach of all.

¹ *The City of To-morrow*, Le Corbusier, translated by Frederick Etchells.

CHAPTER X

THE SECULARIZATION OF THE STATE AND THE FREEDOM OF THE INDIVIDUAL

by

ARCHIBALD ROBERTSON

“Civil and Religious Liberties.

The securing for the individual of the most complete freedom of conduct and self-expression that is consistent with the common welfare. This involves—

- (a) Abolition of literary, dramatic, and film censorship.
- (b) Abolition of restrictions relating to dress, drink, Sunday observance, and freedom of speech.
- (c) Disestablishment and disendowment of all State Churches.
- (d) Abolition of the Blasphemy Laws.”

The Basis of the Federation of Progressive Societies and Individuals.

CHAPTER X

THE SECULARIZATION OF THE STATE AND THE FREEDOM OF THE INDIVIDUAL

“THIS CHRISTIAN COUNTRY”

We are often told that this is a Christian country. In a sense this statement is true; in other senses it is not. It is certainly not true that our public institutions or our private behaviour are founded upon the New Testament. They are not, for the simple reason that they could not be. We do not turn our other cheek to the smiter; nor do we love our enemies. On the contrary, we spend many millions of pounds annually on the fighting services in order that, when the time comes, we may be able to mangle, maim, drown, burn, and suffocate our enemies with the greatest possible efficiency. So far from resisting not evil and judging not that we be not judged, we employ judges, law officers, barristers, police, prison governors, warders, and hangmen with the express purpose of making things unpleasant for evildoers and, in the last resort, putting them to death. Witnesses in our courts of law are, as a general rule, not allowed to let their yea be yea and their nay nay, but are expected, in flat defiance of the Sermon on the Mount, to swear by Almighty God to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. We lay up for ourselves treasure on earth to the very best of our ability. This process is known in polite circles as the accumulation of private capital, and is the foundation of our economic system. Unless we are eccentric to the verge of insanity, we do not generally

give to him that asks, and very frequently turn away from him that would borrow from us. Most of us, especially at this time of "economic blizzard," are anxious for the morrow, and would consider it the height of imprudence to let the morrow take care of itself.

This is certainly not, therefore, a Christian country in the sense that its citizens are practising Christians. It is very doubtful whether a majority of them are even in any adequate sense *believing* Christians. Choose any dozen of your acquaintances at random, repeat the Nicene Creed to them, and ask whether they believe the propositions contained in it. They may think you a little mad; they may consider your question in very bad taste. But it is a safe bet that not half, and it is probable that not a quarter of your random dozen will reply, as their ancestors in the Middle Ages would have replied, with a simple, matter-of-fact affirmative.

THE CHURCH BY LAW ESTABLISHED

There is only one sense in which it is true that ours is a Christian country. A Christian Church, which the largest Christian body in the world, the Roman Catholic, judges to be heretical and schismatic, is established by law as the Church of England. Another Church, equally schismatic and even more heretical in the judgment of most Christians, is established by law as the Church of Scotland. The King is by Act of Parliament Defender of the Faith and Supreme Governor of the Church of England. He is crowned according to her ritual, swears at his coronation to maintain her doctrine and worship, and appoints her archbishops, bishops, deans, and certain other dignitaries on the advice of the Prime Minister

of the day. The relations of the King to the Church of Scotland are less direct, and need not detain us.

By virtue of legal establishment the Church of England enjoys possession of the numerous cathedrals and churches erected for Catholic worship prior to the Reformation, as well as those built for her own worship since, and of the extensive properties attached to them. Certain of these properties take the form of payments known as tithes, dating from the Middle Ages, and enforceable at law against holders of agricultural land, whether members of the Church of England or not. Archbishops and bishops, up to a certain number, sit as "Lords Spiritual" in the House of Peers; and clergy of the Established Church generally enjoy by virtue of their position a status and prestige higher than that accorded to Non-conformist ministers, and, of course, different in kind from any that attaches to plain citizens, who are merely useful in *this* world. No naval or military force is complete without its complement of chaplains appointed and paid by the State to see that officers and men, in the intervals of bombarding, bayoneting, and gassing our enemies, do not forget the worship due to Almighty God. No war can be fought to a successful conclusion without special prayers for victory sanctioned by the archbishops and bishops of the Church of England. And, when the war is over, peace is not peace unless it is first seasoned with special services, sanctioned by the same authorities, of thanksgiving to Almighty God for having blessed our guns, bayonets, torpedoes, aeroplanes, and poison gas with victory over the equivalent devices of the foe.

It is obvious that the kind of Christianity established in this country is very different from any which can be

deduced from the New Testament. To be surprised at this, however, is to write oneself down a simpleton. Every instructed person knows that the question what is and what is not Christianity is to be determined, not by candid study of the Scriptures (a dangerous proceeding which leads usually to contradictory and always to inconvenient conclusions) but by "the mind of the Church." The mind of the Church of England is nowhere better expressed than in her Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion. Vulgarly literal applications of the New Testament are there set aside, and we are plainly told that the goods of Christian men are not common, that a Christian government may punish its subjects with death for heinous and grievous offences, that it is lawful for them at the command of the magistrate to bear weapons and serve in the wars, and that to put it frankly, whatever Christ and His apostles may have said or done, "they didn't know everything down in Judee."

THE ANTHROPOCENTRIC MYTH

This variation of Christianity has been established among us since the sixteenth century. Since then the mental background of the human race has been revolutionized. That background three or four hundred years ago was crudely anthropocentric. Nearly everyone believed that the earth was the centre of the universe, and that it and all that it contained had been created a few thousand years ago on purpose to be the abode of man. On such a hypothesis it was natural to suppose that the Creator of the world took a peculiar interest in the behaviour of mankind, that He had on sundry historical occasions revealed His will to them, and that like a Sultan or Emperor

magnified to colossal proportions, He would reward the obedient with everlasting happiness and punish the disobedient with everlasting torment. The former was to be secured and the latter averted by worshipping the Deity with proper solemnity in accordance with His supposed revelation, observing those taboos (many of them socially valuable, others the reverse) which the Church had inherited from the ancient Jewish religion, and bewailing any breach of such taboos with becoming abjectness and humility. The whole ritual of public worship was, and still is, directed to secure the favour and avert the wrath of the Creator of the universe thus anthropomorphically imagined.

THE MYTH DISCREDITED

During the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries the movement of thought, in the main, has been steadily away from these crude conceptions. The first blow was struck by the astronomers when they demonstrated that the earth was not the centre of the universe, but an insignificant planet of an insignificant star.¹ The second was struck by the geologists and biologists when they demonstrated that life on earth had had a history of hundreds of millions of years before man appeared, and that even man had lived on earth for hundreds of thousands of years before the supposed date of the creation of Adam. The third was struck by the literary and historical critics when they demonstrated that the writings purporting to contain the Divine revela-

¹ It was not for nothing that the Pope and Cardinals took fright at Galileo. They divined correctly, better in fact than he did, where the new discoveries would lead.

tion were a collection of legends, prophecies, and exhortations of uncertain date, more uncertain authorship, corrupted and interpolated texts, and mutually contradictory tendencies.

The result is that to-day it is exceedingly doubtful, as already suggested, whether one-quarter of the British people are in a strict sense Christian believers. Religious apologists in these days are so anxious to clutch at any real or supposed "scientific support," that Sir James Jeans, the astronomer, has become in popular estimation a pillar of the faith. Now the God of Sir James Jeans is a "pure mathematician" outside time and space, who by a mere act of thought brings the universe and its whole history into being, as an artist working at his easel creates a picture. With the process of reasoning by which Sir James reaches this result I am not here concerned. It is obvious that on such a theory mankind and its affairs would be the merest puppet-show, and that anything in the nature of a moral relation between the Creator and His creatures would be inconceivable. How far prayer and thanksgiving (how far, for example, prayers for rain, for the Royal Family, for the High Court of Parliament, and for victory in war) can consistently be addressed to the God of Sir James Jeans I leave the intelligent reader to judge for himself.

WHY THE CHURCH SURVIVES

A further result of this development, if the course of human affairs were logical, would have been the official disavowal of the Christian mythology and the Christian ethics attached to it, and the recognition of the increase of happiness and diminution of misery on earth as the

supreme touchstone of public policy. Unfortunately, this is not the case. Whenever religion is organized, its organization crystallizes into a vested interest, and its social and political defences are certain to remain intact long after its intellectual defences have crumbled. It must be remembered, moreover, that the Church is not an isolated interest bamboozling and defying a world which needs only sufficient enlightenment to unite against and dethrone her. This is the mistake made by the older school of Rationalists. In their view there are only two sides in the struggle, reason and superstition; and the task of the reformer is simply, by continual appeals to reason, to go on winning supporters for "the best of causes" until all the world is reasonable. The picture is false because it leaves entirely out of account the economic, social, and political factors which divide men against one another. Wherever there exists on the one hand an owning and governing class and on the other hand a class of the exploited, religion is far too useful as an auxiliary policeman for the owning class to disdain its aid, whatever may be the measure of their private belief or disbelief. On the intellectual plane Christianity has never been more thoroughly riddled than by Voltaire and the Encyclopaedists in the eighteenth century. Yet from a political and social point of view the Christian religion was probably no less strongly entrenched in Europe (including Britain) in 1878 than in 1778, the year of Voltaire's death; and except in Bolshevik Russia, its entrenchments have hardly been weakened at all in the subsequent half-century. The ruling classes, sceptical to the core beneath their outward conformity in the age of Voltaire, have discovered since then that infidelity, if allowed to infect

the populace, issues in revolution. The Church, they have found, is necessary as an auxiliary policeman, and as such must enjoy the privileges of a policeman. She must be armed with authority, and her prestige defended by the State against any ribald attack, however inconsistent such special protection may be with the principles of enlightenment and individual liberty which are said to lie at the basis of modern civilization.

Civil and religious liberty are popularly believed to have been secured to all British subjects by the struggles of the seventeenth, eighteenth, and early nineteenth centuries. Not the least of our boasted civil liberties is supposed to be "freedom of the Press." Milton's *Areopagitica*, Wilkes and the *North Briton*, Richard Carlile and his repeated imprisonments, Holyoake and the fight against "taxes on knowledge"—such are the memories which that resounding phrase conjures up in the mind of a modern reformer. And, indeed, in times past, when great masses of the rising middle class were united in a common cause by the battle against royal and ecclesiastical domination, and when the printing and circulation of a bellicose broadsheet or pamphlet was an enterprise well within the means of the average literate citizen, liberty of the Press was a weapon on the side of reform which it was well worth a struggle to secure. To-day, however, the situation is very different. As in other fields of capitalist enterprise, so in the newspaper world, small independent concerns have given place to "big business"; competition has reached its natural term in monopoly. It now needs a capital of millions to print

and distribute a successful daily paper. The result is a “tied press” concentrated in the hands of a few wealthy syndicates, who compete with one another for circulation (in so far as they *do* compete and are not mutually interlocked) by pandering to the lowest common intellectual denominator of the semi-literate mob of wage-slaves manufactured by our economic and educational system. Sporting and betting news, sex offences and murders, sentimental serials and money competitions, together make up the normal pabulum of the mass of newspaper readers.

In these circumstances, what chance is there of any unpopular cause, or any issue the comprehension of which demands at least *some* intellectual effort, being accorded prominence in our great “organs of public opinion”? There is just one chance. The cause in question may coincide so closely with the financial or other interests of the owner that he will mobilize his newspapers in its support despite its unpopularity. Thus a newspaper owner, being a very rich man, naturally wishes his supertax to be lessened. The cause of “economy,” which means scaling down the incomes of poor people in order to reduce the taxation of the rich, will, therefore, have his enthusiastic patronage. His newspapers will not, of course, put the issue so baldly as this. They will inveigh in leaded type against “wastrels” and “squander-maniacs,” pretend that the whole proceeds of supertax go into the pockets of greedy officials, and tell their poorer readers that they will be better off after the “economies” than before. In a case such as this a thing unpopular with a large section of the public may, with suitable camouflage, be “put across” by a great daily. But such cases are exceptional. Where the interests of

the owner are not engaged on the side of change, and still more where they are definitely adverse to it, no cause need look for fair play. Letters on behalf of Socialism and Internationalism will be suppressed; Communist or anti-war meetings, however largely attended, will not be reported; and "news" generally will be selected and edited in such a way as to present a consistently one-sided picture of the way the world is going. In short, as Lenin put it, liberty of the Press under Capitalism means the liberty of men who are rich enough to own newspapers to lie to those who are only rich enough to buy them. Under Capitalism as it now is, it is impossible to regard so-called freedom of the Press as the unmixed social good which it admittedly was under other and simpler economic circumstances.

THE BLASPHEMY LAWS

By an ironical coincidence the statute law of blasphemy in its present shape, except for one particular, dates from the reign of that hero of Whig historians and saviour *par excellence* of our civil and religious liberties, William of Orange. The Blasphemy Act of 1697–1698 enacts that, if any person, educated in or having made profession of the Christian religion, shall by writing, preaching, teaching, or advised speaking deny any one of the Persons of the Holy Trinity to be God, or shall assert or maintain that there are more gods than one, or shall deny the Christian religion to be true or the Holy Scriptures to be of Divine authority, he shall upon the first offence be rendered incapable of holding any office or place of trust, and for the second incapable of bringing any action, of being guardian or executor, or of taking a legacy or

deed of gift, and shall suffer three years' imprisonment without bail. An Act of 1812-1813 relieves Unitarians from these penalties. Otherwise the statute law on the subject remains unaltered.

Prosecutions for blasphemy are in practice instituted not under this statute, but under the common law of England, which treats all denials of God or His Providence, all contumacious reproaches of Jesus Christ, and all profane scoffing at Holy Scripture as punishable by fine, imprisonment, and corporal punishment. In the course of the last century the tendency has been to use these powers somewhat circumspectly. As lately as 1867 a court of law affirmed that Christianity was part and parcel of the law of England, and that in attacks upon Christianity the law itself was attacked. More recently, it has been ruled that the offence of blasphemy is committed only when such an attack takes an insulting form. In actual fact, therefore, proceedings are levelled only against those members of the community to whom our social system has allowed only an elementary education and a limited vocabulary, and who are unable to express themselves otherwise than crudely. Blasphemy, in short, like sleeping out, has become a poor man's offence.

From time to time attempts have been made to repeal the Blasphemy Laws. The latest of these attempts was in 1930, when a Bill introduced by Mr. Ernest Thurtle passed its second reading in the House of Commons. It is significant that this Bill was opposed by the whole strength of the Conservative Party in the House. To that opposition, reinforced by the defection of certain weak-kneed Liberal and Labour members, and by the equivocal attitude of the then Labour Government, we owe the

destruction of this Bill in Committee and the perpetuation of this antiquated blot on our legal system.

WHY BLASPHEMY IS STILL A CRIME

Those accustomed to the frank, questioning atmosphere of advanced movements may think it unaccountable and even incredible that the entire force of one political party, assisted by reputable members of the other two, should have been successfully mobilized to maintain on the statute book enactments framed for the protection of one particular religion. Those familiar with the mentality of the ordinary politician may even wonder how many Members of Parliament who voted against the repeal of the Blasphemy Laws are themselves sincere believers in the truth of Christianity and the Divine authority of Holy Scripture, impugners of which they are so anxious to punish. The whole thing becomes credible and intelligible only when we remember that, as Belfort Bax put it fifty years ago, "the *bourgeoisie* is acute enough to connect Atheism and Communism." Christianity may or may not be part and parcel of the law of England; but the *profession* of Christianity is without doubt part and parcel of the essential cement of the capitalist system. As long as that system endures, therefore, our public men will for the most part continue to do lip-service to a religion in which only a minority of them sincerely believe, and to resist to the utmost all attempts to put Christianity on the same legal level as other forms of opinion.

BROADCASTING

The British Broadcasting Corporation, which by Act of Parliament is the sole purveyor of radio entertainment

in this country, naturally holds itself at the absolute disposal of the established order and the established religion. The privilege of transmitting religious services over the ether is accorded with admirable impartiality to the various Churches, or at least to all of them who possess sufficient wealth and standing to make themselves a nuisance; and a brand of theology known as "B.B.C. religion"—a sort of highest common factor of all the Christian denominations—has been specially invented for broadcasting on those occasions when no particular sect is in possession of the microphone. This impartiality ceases, however, when it is a question of transmitting views antithetic to supernaturalism. Some years ago Mr. Wells, Professor J. B. S. Haldane, and certain others were allowed to broadcast addresses of a Freethinking tendency; but such strong objection was taken by the Churches that facilities of this nature are no longer given.¹ Similarly in the political field, when controversy or debate is permitted at all, the use of the microphone is strictly confined to those parties, Conservative, Liberal, and Labour, which, in practice at all events, agree in working within the limits of the Capitalist Parliamentary system. The exclusion of the Communist from broadcast controversy is as complete as that of the Atheist.

THE SUNDAY TABOO

From the privileged position occupied by the Christian religion in the present social order, the natural result follows that physical, recreational, and cultural enjoy-

¹ While this book was in the press, Professor J. S. Huxley was allowed to broadcast a talk on Rationalism. This exception—the first for years—is one of those which prove the rule.

ments are at any time liable to encounter the veto of Christianity or of some taboo which a historical accident has identified with Christianity. For obscure reasons, probably of astrological origin, the Jewish religion from its inception prohibited the performance of any kind of work on the *seventh* day of the week. Christians, on the other hand, have always celebrated "the Lord's day" on the *first* day of the week. The two observances have clearly nothing to do with one another, and in Catholic countries no one would dream of confusing the Christian Sunday with the Jewish Sabbath.¹ Among Protestants, however, and particularly those of English speech, the widespread but superficial study of the Bible which set in with the Reformation led to the taboos attaching to the Sabbath being uncritically transferred *holus bolus* to Sunday. No manner of work, therefore, must be done on Sunday; and as the provision of any form of entertainment is apt to involve work, no entertainment either must be enjoyed on Sunday so far as Puritan kill-joys (by no means confined to the Free Churches) can possibly prevent it.

The question of Sunday observance should not be confused, as its advocates of set design confuse it, with the quite different issue of the worker's claim to a periodical day of rest. It would be the simplest thing in the world to arrange that all persons obliged to work on Sunday should enjoy an alternative day of rest in the week. In fact there is no reason, apart from superstition, why the day of rest should be observed every seventh day rather than, as in Russia, every fifth or sixth day. The

¹ In Latin countries the term "sabbath" (*sabbato, sabado, samedi*) is uniformly applied to Saturday, not Sunday.

attempt of the Sabbatarian to don the disguise of a proletarian champion is therefore simply hypocritical. Provided that the right of the worker to a day of rest not less than once in seven days is enforced, there is no necessity for any legislative or municipal recognition of Sunday as such.

DRAMATIC AND FILM CENSORSHIP

Owing to the fact that the interests of the entertainment industry favour the relaxation of Sunday restrictions and that the forces of religion themselves are divided on this issue, the prospects of progress in this direction are brighter than in others. In most departments, however, the powers that be stand foursquare in defence of the religious and ethical standards of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. It goes without saying that any dramatic production or film which directly attacks established religion or morals is liable to censorship. Not only so, but any work may confidently be expected to come under the ban if, without any direct challenge, it treats these subjects with sufficient candour to evoke "dangerous thoughts" in the minds of a possible audience. The exploits of the British censorship of plays during the last forty years are notorious. Ibsen's *Ghosts* was banned because it introduced the subject of venereal disease and challenged the accepted sexual code; Shaw's *Mrs. Warren's Profession*, because it discussed the problem of prostitution; Maeterlinck's *Monna Vanna* because in one scene the heroine was supposed to have nothing on beneath her cloak! The dramatic censorship, of course, is not always based on religious or moral grounds. A further convention prohibits the representa-

tion on the stage of any sovereign of the reigning royal house. Mr. Laurence Housman's one-act dramas dealing with the life of Queen Victoria, though witty, sympathetic, and, one would suppose, inoffensive to anyone with a sense of humour or proportion, are nevertheless unplayable. This class of ban is in reality semi-religious. A British sovereign, according to the fiction maintained for popular consumption by our politicians and Press, is a quasi-divine being whose every word and deed is the embodiment of quintessential majesty, wisdom, and altruism; and this myth must not be shattered by the exhibition of the supposed idol, even if a generation dead, as a fallible man or woman of like passions with ourselves. This quasi-apotheosis of the sovereign, like other established superstitions, is part of the defensive mechanism of Capitalist society. It serves to veil, as with a picturesque medieval tapestry, the ugly, naked truth that society is divided into exploiters and exploited, and to conjure up when necessary the traditional emotionalism of "King and Country" which sends young men to agony and death in the wars which are the necessary fruit of capitalist concession-hunting.¹

LITERARY CENSORSHIP

Another direct result of the privileged status accorded to the Christian religion is the benighted attitude of the

¹ It is noteworthy that while any film realistically exposing war for what it is would be subject to drastic censorship, films glorifying war enjoy the special protection of the authorities. Two undergraduates were in September 1933 sentenced at Swindon to a month's imprisonment for interrupting the film *Our Fighting Navy*. They were subsequently bound over and released. Had the film not been of a "patriotic" nature, they would have got off with a mild fine.

law, and of those who interpret and apply it, to the whole subject of sex. The subject is dealt with by another contributor to this volume, and need not therefore be treated here except to stress two points. First, the official acceptance of the irrational sex-code which Christianity adopted from Judaism leads to vexatious and tyrannical interferences with literary freedom which have nothing to do with "decency," and admit of no utilitarian defence whatever. Miss Radclyffe Hall's *The Well of Loneliness* was not an indecent book. It was never alleged that it contained a single gross expression or a single "purple passage." Had it been let alone its appeal would certainly have been very small. But it dealt with the problem of homosexuality, and contained an implicit criticism of the Hebraic-Christian moral code on the subject. That eminent moralist, Mr. James Douglas, accordingly clamoured for its suppression in the public Press. Police proceedings were instituted, Miss Hall branded as an indecent writer, her book destroyed, and the array of eminent authors who were ready to testify to the high tone of her work insultingly rebuffed by the magistrate, with no other object than to vindicate the pre-scientific views of the Pentateuch and the Pauline Epistles on sexual abnormality.

DRESS RESTRICTIONS

Secondly, this superstitious attitude to sex leads by a natural transition to a corresponding fanaticism on the subject of dress or its absence. Mention has already been made of the ridiculous figure cut by the dramatic censorship in the case of *Monna Vanna*. Nowadays irrationality on this topic manifests itself most commonly

in one of two quarters. The clergy of the Roman Catholic Church from the Pope downward, being vowed to celibacy, naturally suffer from a morbid interest in such matters, and their pronouncements on the subject of female dress invariably make comic reading. Apart from the Catholic hierarchy, fulminations on the subject generally emanate from the city fathers of some chapel-ridden seaside resort. As their jurisdiction is only local, their outbursts need not be taken tragically. When, however, a high judicial authority like the Recorder of London betrays similar want of balance the matter becomes serious. To inveigh in open court against nudist "cults" and "societies" and to enjoin the police to "keep an eye on them," as Sir Ernest Wild did in a recent case, illustrates the wide opening for petty persecution and tyranny that will continue to exist as long as laws are made and administered by minds befogged with prejudice.

THE CONQUEST OF FREEDOM

In a society resolved to base its institutions on the knowledge of the twentieth century and not on the ignorance of the sixteenth, the explicit and sole object of all State action would be the maximization of happiness and the minimization of misery on earth, and the only barriers to individual freedom would be those necessary to secure and advance this object. This is not to be understood as a declaration in favour of Individualism. Restrictions on individual behaviour, especially in the economic sphere, are likely to be considerable in any State as yet within the range of practical possibilities. But while there is good utilitarian justification for such restrictions as are

necessary to co-ordinate individual effort for the achievement of common satisfactions, there can be none for those imposed solely in the interests of a disputable and increasingly discredited body of moral and metaphysical dogma. The disestablishment and disendowment of all Churches and the secularization of all public life, especially public education, would mark the formal disavowal by the State of that body of dogma, and render possible a wholesale recasting of our legal system on a utilitarian basis, every step in which is at present blocked by the organized and united forces of an artificially entrenched superstition. It is a matter of dispute whether such a programme can be carried through within the framework of the present economic order, or whether, as Marxists believe, the official repudiation of Christianity and its characteristic taboos presupposes the repudiation of the capitalist system of which Christianity is now but the tool. I incline to the latter view. But even on this view it is necessary that the war against irrational taboos should be waged without ceasing, if only to demonstrate the variety of ways in which our present social order hampers and hinders the march of humanity towards a freer and fuller life. The Federation of Progressive Societies and Individuals exists for the purpose of convincing those reformers who are at present waging an uphill battle for this, that, or the other particular freedom, that their different causes are in reality *one* cause, and that in a united front based on a common ideology lies the surest guarantee of victory.

CHAPTER XI

A PSYCHOLOGY FOR PROGRESSIVES HOW CAN THEY BECOME EFFECTIVE?

by

J. C. FLUGEL

CHAPTER XI

A PSYCHOLOGY FOR PROGRESSIVES—HOW CAN THEY BECOME EFFECTIVE?

NEED OF A COMMON PSYCHOLOGICAL BACKGROUND

The existence of any political or propagandist body implies a certain community of ideas among its members; and when any new body such as the Federation of Progressive Societies and Individuals comes into being we may reasonably, and perhaps profitably, ask: What is the psychological background that has brought a group of persons together in some degree of common enthusiasm (or at least common agreement) with regard to the various items of its programme? An enquiry of this kind is, perhaps, more than usually pertinent in the case of the Federation of Progressive Societies and Individuals, which has come forward with a new programme and which invites those who have already (by their membership of an appropriate society) signified their approval of one item on this programme to join forces in the furtherance of a wider, but presumably co-ordinated, set of aims. Such an endeavour presupposes that there is some degree of psychological harmony between these aims, so that while any given individual will naturally—in virtue of his innate disposition and past history—cherish some one or other special aim beyond all others, he will yet be favourable to the programme as a whole and realize that all the items in it tend to stand or fall together. The question therefore naturally arises, whether it is possible to say anything more about the “psychological harmony”

in question. It would, we might imagine, be instructive to state the nature of this harmony in terms of modern mental science; and it would be reassuring, too, if the aims which are thus harmonized could be shown to be reasonable ones in the light of what psychology has got to say about the facts of individual and social development.

CONFUSION OF MODERN PSYCHOLOGY

The attempt to answer such a question involves us in at least two formidable difficulties. In the first place, starting out, as we necessarily do, with a prejudice in favour of the aims that we ourselves feel to be desirable, there is a likelihood of our so selecting or distorting our psychology as to throw the most favourable light upon them. An *ex parte* treatment of scientific results is a very dangerous thing, as we have reason to know to our cost, for instance, in the case of economics. We must be on our guard, therefore, during our examination, and treat our results (especially in so far as they appear to be encouraging) with the caution appropriate to a preliminary testing rather than with the whole-hearted acceptance due to a final and convincing proof. In the second place, there is the difficulty arising from the present condition of psychology. Divided as it is into a number of schools, each to some extent pursuing its own methods, using its own concepts, and expressing its results in its own peculiar jargon, it can scarcely speak with full and undivided authority on any issue whatsoever. We are, therefore, forced to pick upon such results and conclusions as appear to be most helpful for our purpose, and to express them in the terminology of the school which has

provided these results. For this reason also, then, our findings must be treated cautiously. By common consent, psychology is still a backward science. Nevertheless, it has made some real, though still uncoordinated, progress in a number of directions, and there is a growing recognition of the important rôle that it ought to play in human affairs, now that the disproportionate advance of the physical sciences is showing itself to be an equivocal blessing. Feeble and flickering as the light of psychology may be, it is yet preferable to the utter darkness of ignorance or guesswork.

PSYCHOLOGICAL TENDENCIES OF PROGRESSIVES

When we look for some general preliminary indication of the common psychological foundation of the programme of the F.P.S.I., we naturally tend to find it in the word "progressive." The common bond between the members of the Federation must surely lie, if anywhere, in their "progressiveness." But we must beware of submitting the idea of progress to a mere logical or philosophical analysis. We are concerned here, not with the ultimate nature or implications of progress, but with the psychological tendencies that make us what we call progressive. Progress implies change in a desirable direction, but when it comes to social affairs, the changes usually contemplated are such as are likely to encounter the disapproval and opposition of conservatively minded persons. Our conception of "progress," in fact, implies a revolt against certain existing conventions, interests, or ideals, as a glance at the principal items on the Federation's programme will immediately reveal.

RELEVANCE OF PSYCHO-ANALYSIS

Now it seems to the present writer that, of all existing schools of psychology, that of psycho-analysis is at the present moment most capable of throwing light both upon the forces of conservatism against which "progressives" have rebelled and upon the opposite tendencies which are moulding their own aims and ideals. It so happens that during the last ten years or so the workers belonging to the psycho-analytic school have made a great advance in the understanding of the central problems of social "progress"—a fact which justifies us, especially in a short treatment of the present kind, in looking at things definitely from their point of view. The part of their doctrine which most concerns us here deals with an aspect of the human mind which they have called the "super-ego."

DOCTRINE OF THE SUPER-EGO

This "super-ego" is the moral factor in the mental life of man. It embraces what earlier psychologists have called the "moral sense" or the "moral consciousness," but it includes more than this, for psycho-analysis claims to have shown that much of our morality is unconscious. Just as in the earlier days of its existence psycho-analysis shocked many people with its insistence upon the omnipresence of the *sexual* impulses, and the part these play in infancy and in the unconscious life of adults, so in more recent years it has been responsible for revelations no less striking as to the influence and manifestations of our unconscious *moral* tendencies. As Freud has put it, in words that deserve to be widely

quoted, psycho-analysis has shown that "the normal man is not only far more immoral than he believes, but more moral than he has any idea of." Opposed to primitive instinct and desire, there would appear to exist an almost equally primitive inhibitory mechanism in the human mind. Furthermore, the troubles that we experience in adjusting ourselves to civilized social life seem to be due, not merely, as earlier moralists had supposed, to the strength of our a-social instincts, but also, in no inconsiderable degree, to the power of the primitive moral factors embodied in the super-ego. For the unconscious morality in question is a rigid and archaic one, which adapts itself only with the utmost difficulty to the changing conditions of modern life. As the work of child analysts in recent years has shown,¹ the super-ego begins to be formed at an extremely early age, so that, by the time the child is a few years old, it has built up powerful inhibitions of a moral kind, and is capable of feeling guilt, contrition, and a "need for punishment" in connection, not only with its actions, but with its unfulfilled desires.

RÔLE OF PARENTS, ELDERS, AND IMPORTANT PERSONS

To a very large extent the actual nature and commands (or perhaps, more strictly speaking, prohibitions) of the super-ego are determined by the behaviour and moral attitude of our parents and the other impressive persons of our early environment; a process which is continued throughout life, whenever we come into contact with a

¹ See especially Melanie Klein, *The Psycho-analysis of Children*, 1932, and Susan Isaacs, *Social Development in Young Children*, 1933.

powerful personality or one whom circumstances invest with a show of authority (our teachers, taskmasters, and "superiors" generally). We tend, in fact, especially in early years, to incorporate the morality of the more important individuals who surround us, to take them to some extent as our ideal and fashion ourselves upon the model they afford. In this respect psycho-analysis only reinforces what psychologists and moralists have always taught, for the significance of ideals in the formation of our characters has long been recognized; though psycho-analysts have shown that the process begins earlier and has a more profound significance than had been supposed.

INCORPORATION OF INDIVIDUAL'S AGGRESSIONESS

But this is only half the story. Though the super-ego incorporates or "introjects" (to use the technical term) the morality of our parents and those who stand to us psychologically *in loco parentis* throughout life, it is yet no mere copy of their behaviour or of their expressed injunctions. Paradoxically enough, the super-ego seems to be, in many ways and in many cases, fiercer and sterner than were the external authorities on whose model it was fashioned. Here is a pretty problem which is still engaging the attention of psycho-analysts. Whence is derived this additional severity? We are not yet in a position to provide a detailed answer. But in general psycho-analysts are fairly well agreed that it results from a taking-over by the super-ego of some of the individual's own aggressiveness; in other words, it represents a recoil of his aggressiveness upon himself. We are (the fact is obvious) born with powerful instinctive drives, and react with aggression

when these are frustrated. Even the mildest process of education during infancy necessitates frustration; we are not always fed when we are hungry; we are not allowed to deposit our excreta when and where we like; we are not allowed to handle or play with everything we wish, not even when the desired thing is a part of our own bodies. Presently we make the profoundly dissatisfying discovery that we have to share with others the affections and interests of our parents or other persons whom we love. There is, therefore, ample opportunity for the arousal of aggressive impulses in young children, and these impulses are naturally directed against our parents or nurses, who appear to be the cause of our frustrations. But our resentment cannot safely find expression along these channels; we love these very people, are dependent on them, and require their love. In this dilemma we adopt a device of which we are destined to make much use throughout our lives: we invert our hate and hostility and direct them against ourselves.

AGGRESSIONESS DIRECTED UPON THE SELF

We need not discuss here whether we first "project" this hate upon our parents, making them appear in the light of dread and powerful enemies because they have frustrated us—a procedure which is adopted *en masse* at a certain stage of culture, in which the world is peopled with imaginary hostile "spirits," which we now see to be nothing but projections of human fears and hates—and then introject into ourselves this distorted and awe-inspiring image of "authority"; or whether our hostility turns back upon ourselves more immediately, as soon as its expression is prevented, and there joins a

moral parent image that is already introjected, giving it a sterner character. In any case the outcome of the process is that Nature, by one of her remarkable tricks of adaptation, has succeeded in converting an outwardly directed aggressiveness into an inner self-criticizing, self-controlling, and self-punishing factor which is the most potent—though most primitive—element of our moral constitution.

ENTRY OF SADISTIC AND MASOCHISTIC IMPULSES

Even this, however, is not an adequate account of the whole matter. Brief and dogmatic as our present statement of the psycho-analytic findings must necessarily be, we must not omit reference to a further most important fact, viz., that added to the aggressive tendencies that function in the super-ego—either by way of original constitution or by subsequent fusion—there is an element which appears to be of a “libidinal” or sexual nature: an element which, when its sexual significance is unmistakable, we call sadism or masochism, according to whether it is directed against others or against the self, and in virtue of which we experience sexual satisfaction in the infliction or suffering of pain. When the super-ego exercises its severe authority, it would seem that both sadistic and masochistic tendencies are simultaneously gratified within the personality—as though the school-master who (outwardly with moral indignation, but inwardly with secret sensual pleasure) inflicts a birching, and the pupil who (with genuine pain, but perhaps also with an answering satisfaction of his own) endures it, were fused into a single being. In view of the fact that the super-ego, like our external ethical authorities, disap-

proves heartily of most forms of sexual satisfaction, it will be easily understood that the complications due to this strange alliance are considerable.

CONTROL OF THE ID

For one thing, it makes it more difficult for us to understand the exact relationship between the super-ego and that other portion of the mind, which Freud (following Groddeck and Nietzsche) has called the "id," and which is looked upon as the reservoir of the instincts, the ultimate propelling forces of the organism. It is to control the id that the super-ego has been called into existence, but the super-ego, as we have seen, makes use of certain elements of the aggressive and the sexual instincts for its own purposes. Indeed, the super-ego is not above striking a bargain with the instincts generally, as a result of which a certain amount of (otherwise forbidden) instinctual gratification is allowed, on condition that it is indulged under cover of some moral pretext (as we see, alike in the case of the schoolmaster administering corporal punishment, in that of the inquisitor administering torture in the name of his religion, and in that of the statesman or ruler proclaiming a holy war). Or, alternatively, the gratification may be paid for in terms of the individual's own suffering, as happens for instance in the case of the criminal who has been harshly treated by society and feels that the ordinary rules of morality no longer apply to him; of the man who (like Richard III) has been cruelly dealt with by Nature; of the neurotic who—as psycho-analysis has shown—inflicts compensatory pain, bodily or mental, on himself; or of the "neurotic character" who contrives to find this

suffering in the course of his ordinary life, through loss of money, failure in work or love, or by some other means.

FUNCTION OF THE EGO

A third aspect of the mind, according to the Freudian psychology, is to be found in the ego, which is the conscious personality, in virtue of which we perceive the outer world, reason according to the laws of logic, and generally adapt ourselves to our environment. The ego has allotted to it the difficult task of endeavouring to strike a compromise between the demands of three hard taskmasters, who are often enough at cross-purposes with one another: the instincts (the id), the super-ego, and the outer-world (human or otherwise). It is in virtue of the ego, however (helped by the mechanism of sublimation, through which the energy of the primitive instincts can be diverted to more complex and "cultural" aims), that man has achieved that control of his environment on which modern civilization is so largely built. Now the aim of psycho-analytic treatment is to strengthen the control of the ego over the super-ego and the id, so as to enable the problems of the individual's life to be dealt with by the more delicate powers of conscious reason and discrimination rather than by the more primitive methods whereby the super-ego and the id strive to settle their differences and attain their ends.

RÔLES OF THE PROGRESSIVE AND THE PSYCHO-ANALYST COMPARED

We may now endeavour to see how this psychology, which we have so briefly and inadequately sketched, bears upon the outlook and functions of the F.P.S.I.

In the first place, we may note a certain general parallelism between the attitude of the "progressive" reformer and that of the psycho-analyst. The "progressive" aims at the establishment of a world order in which science, reason, and individual freedom of thought and action, together with the tolerance and understanding that these imply, shall take the place of blind reliance on outworn loyalties, conventions, and taboos, or on their modern communist- or fascist-coloured substitutes.¹ Stated in terms of the individual mind, the goal of the psycho-analyst is much the same; for the forces of conservatism are also those of conscience, which is but the more conscious portion of the super-ego. And, just as the progressive believes that tradition or prejudice must give place to reason, if the world of society is to become a pleasanter and safer place, so also does the psycho-analyst find that the process of enabling the individual conscious ego to achieve a greater measure of control over the whole personality regularly implies some considerable reduction in the power and demands of the super-ego. For these demands are rigid, unreasonable, and out of date, and prevent the individual from doing his best, either for himself or for society.

We wrote just now of "tolerance" and "understanding"; advisedly, since the exercise of these virtues would seem to be a corollary of the "progressive" ideal of a social order based on liberty and reason, just as intolerance and the suppression of free enquiry are of necessity to be

¹ I am referring here, of course, only to the elements of *intolerance and compulsion* in the modern developments of communism and fascism, not to their constructive aspects, many of which will doubtless find a place in any "progressive" policy.

found in a society run on rigidly conservative, communist, or fascist lines. The attitude of the truly "progressive" society is one which is predominantly *scientific and psychological*, as contrasted with the more *moral* attitude of other régimes, inasmuch as the ideal of control through understanding must, over large fields, take the place of insistence on obedience to a fixed ethical code, all departure from which is branded as "immoral" without further investigation into its causes or consequences. Here again the social change that is desired closely resembles that produced in the individual as the result of a successful psycho-analytic treatment. We may note also, by way of encouragement, that this replacement of the moral by the psychological and scientific point of view is one that is actually taking place in the evolution of society. At a primitive level the concepts of "guilt" and "punishment" tend to be applied not only to all human behaviour, but to animals and even to inanimate objects.¹

SUBSTITUTION OF REASONED UNDERSTANDING FOR MORAL INDIGNATION

In modern times the doctrine of moral responsibility is ceasing to be applied to the troublesome (formerly the "naughty") child, and even to some extent to his adult counterpart, the criminal; while it is, in theory at any rate, no longer applied at all to the insane who were formerly treated in the same way as criminals. In all these spheres we are slowly coming to realize that in the long run it

¹ As is testified by the various judicial trials of animals that have taken place in bygone ages. Startling relics of this attitude are, however, to be found even to-day; thus it appears that according to the law of New Jersey an automobile that has caused the death of someone has to be destroyed.

is more profitable to seek to understand and modify by appropriate treatment than to give way to moral indignation, or punish according to some arbitrary rule. Unfortunately, in one of the most important fields of all—that of politics, there are as yet few signs of this healing change of standpoint.

The “progressive” attitude thus stands for a free use of reason in dealing with our problems, as opposed to a reliance on authority, whether that authority be internal conscience, external government, or supernatural sanction. Psychologically speaking, these three authorities are, from the standpoint of the individual mind, much the same. They are all descendants of the original parent authority, in the first case introjected into the mind, in the second case displaced on to persons or institutions of the outer world, in the third case projected into the heavens in the shape of gods. Such an attitude is inevitably a rebellious one. In demanding freedom to use our faculties to the full, we necessarily to a large extent side with the id rather than the super-ego; and, in so doing, we identify ourselves with the aspirations of children rather than with the authority of parents. Hence, it has been possible for one psycho-analytic writer to describe the details of the struggle against authority in many different fields under the general title *Father or Sons?*¹

AVOIDANCE OF REVOLUTIONARY MOOD AND METHOD

If, however, we are to avoid the excesses to which revolutionaries are prone (and which always avenge themselves by a relapse to authoritarianism), we must remember that, in psycho-analytical terminology, we are not aiming

¹ Prys Hopkins, *Father or Sons?* 1927.

at the abolition of the authority of the super-ego in order to give free rein to the id, but in order, as far as possible, to replace it by the authority of the ego. Not that we need have any fear of a permanent abolition of the super-ego. Apart from certain questionable pathological cases which it is beyond our present province to discuss, the super-ego is much too firmly established in the human mind. Pent up instincts may, however, indulge in temporary outbreaks of a genuinely dangerous kind. In the well-ordered and relatively free individual or society these are not likely to occur, but under a repressive régime, psychological or social, there is a danger of the instincts bursting forth in a wild orgy of brief destructive fury. It is a relatively easy matter to destroy, and most revolutions have successfully dispossessed the privileged without achieving the greater lasting benefit of society as a whole. For this latter task more is required than savage lust or hatred; it is here that we need, not only the energy of instinct, but the control of understanding as manifested in the highest sublimations.

OPPOSITION TO AUTOMATIC LOYALTIES

The "progressive" aims, then, at the ordered substitution of reasoned control for the dictatorial power of ruler, conscience, or tradition. And he will, therefore, tend to find himself in conflict with many of those old institutions which a conservative loyalty would bid us reverence. Unreasoning allegiance to king or country ("my mother drunk or sober" is a psychologically correct caricature of the attitude of the unquestioning patriot), to unworthy privilege in sex or property, to utterly unjustifiable or superstitious restrictions and taboos

(such as many of those that relate to sex or the exposure of the body), must inevitably be discarded.

But although it is in general easy to recognize in all these things the mark of an outworn authority which the new order must combat, there are aspects of them, of great importance to a proper estimation of their meaning, which are readily overlooked until they are surveyed in the light of modern psychology. It must be our business here to mention a few at least of the most significant among these aspects.

NEED TO EXORCISE PUNISHMENT-GUILT SENTIMENT

In the first place, it is important to realize that emancipation from metaphysical superstitions by no means necessarily implies freedom from the associated morality of fear and guilt. Only too often the atheist merely transfers the savage unreasonableness of a primitive Jehovah to his own almost equally primitive super-ego. Now it is true, of course, that the abandonment of an external authority must (both psychologically and ethically) involve its replacement by an inner one, and that such replacement is in the line of progress. But this mere process of substitution is only one step on the road of moral development. A further and not less important step consists in acquiring freedom from the sense of guilt and the "need for punishment"; and, as regards these, the super-ego can be just as harsh and implacable as a cruel and relentless deity, whose pleasure it is to demand fear, sacrifice, and penance from his worshippers.¹ The atheistical Puritan is just as much alarmed

¹ As Bernard Shaw has so well brought out in *Too True to be Good*.

at the prospect of human triumph or enjoyment as the religious bigot, though he can no longer invoke an adequate metaphysical rationalization in support of his ascetic views. He is secretly terrified at the idea that it may be possible to diminish human suffering; as though some hostile deity were still ready to destroy men and women for their impertinence in trying to escape from the suffering which it was his divine pleasure to inflict upon them. Hence the fierce objections that were raised in the last century to the use of anaesthetics in surgery or childbirth. Hence, too, much of the present opposition to birth control, to the legalization of abortion, to the prevention of venereal disease. The notion that it may be possible to obtain satisfaction without the corresponding "natural" penalty is alarming and repulsive to those who have projected their "need for punishment" upon the whole human race. As Glover has recently pointed out¹ the same attitude accounts for much of the irrationality in virtue of which we fail to take adequate steps to prevent war, though we realize its waste and cruelty. Openly or secretly, we still believe the pain and sacrifice of war is good for us; for such is the divine will. As a recent Nazi writer puts it: "The dying warrior dies more easily when he knows that his blood is ebbing for his national God."² Similarly, as a number of recent writers have pointed out, we are unwilling to recognize the dawn of a potential "age of plenty." The idea that all may have an ample supply of desirable goods and leisure to enjoy them appears, not merely too good to be true, but too terrifyingly wicked to be translated into practice. Poverty and grinding

¹ *War, Sadism, and Pacifism*, 1933.

² E. Banse, *Wehrwissenschaft*, 1933.

toil in economics (like unpalatable cramming and rigid discipline in education) help us to alleviate our sense of guilt. The puritanical ideal of painful duty is thus sharply contrasted with the progressive view that the best work is performed under the influence, not of conscience or compulsion, but of the inner urge that is due to sublimation.

AND THE SENTIMENT OF UNCONSCIOUS ENVY

Added to the more purely sadistic or aggressive tendencies that find expression in moral condemnation there are further tendencies which can best be described as those of *moral envy*. The Puritan has a strong objection to others enjoying pleasures which he denies himself, and rejoices exceedingly when he sees the "wicked" punished, especially when (owing to an apparent oversight on the part of God or providence) he feels called upon to inflict the punishment himself. Tendencies of this kind are to be found alike in the way children will punish their dolls or "imaginary companions" for the commission of imaginary naughtinesses (which the said children would like to commit themselves), in the malicious sexual gossip and scandal-mongering of adults, and in the insistence on the "exemplary" punishment of criminals, irrespective of whether the punishment is likely to exercise a reformatory influence or not.

FEAR IN INTERNATIONAL POLITICS AND IN ECONOMICS

In all these cases there is a *projection* upon others of the Puritan's own "guilty" tendencies. Indeed, the mechanism of projection plays a great part in those social manifestations of the super-ego which the progressive has to overcome. But aggressiveness, as well as guilt,

can be projected, and the alarming, frustrating parent-figures that (as previously explained) our infantile imaginations may have conjured up can be "displaced," not only on to the fantastic creations of primitive theology, but on to living persons. This takes place frequently enough in war, when the enemy stands not only for the "wicked" portion of ourselves, but for the feared and hated aspects of our parents. It is here that the famous "Oedipus complex" comes in, and, as several psychoanalysts have pointed out, the fears and suspicions which play so tragic a part in international politics often have their roots in the remote, irrational, child-parent relationships of infancy. Our native land is our mother, whom we would fain keep for ourselves and defend against the detested intrusion of a hostile father figure, represented for the time being by the enemy.

Similar displacements of infantile fears and hatreds are to be found in the economic sphere. The lust for individual possession of property, the fear of deprivation and the envy of others who have more possessions than ourselves, are very similar to sexual possessiveness, jealousy, and envy, and often spring ultimately from the same irrational source.¹ This is not to say that, both in economics and in sex, such feelings may not have some real and present justification; nevertheless, they are often altogether out of proportion to their present and apparent cause. Furthermore, this present cause could be removed or much reduced, if it were not for the mutual and unreasonable fear and envy of the individuals or classes concerned.

¹ See, e.g., R. Money-Kyrle, *The Development of the Sexual Impulses*, 1932, ch. 6.

IMPORTANCE OF PSYCHOLOGICAL UNDERSTANDING

In these matters, and in a multitude of others, psychology is beginning to show us why men act as unreasonably as they do, why they so perpetually and wilfully ruin their own chances of success and happiness, why they persist in turning the gifts of physical science into a menace rather than a boon. And in the light of this understanding (and perhaps in no other way) is there some prospect of abolishing this irrational self-inflicted torture. Here, then, psychology may show itself the most potent of the sciences, so far as human welfare is concerned. Here too lies the supreme justification for that replacement of the moral by the psychological point of view, of which we wrote above, for that strengthening of the understanding reasonable ego, as against the cruder and more unconscious control by the super-ego, which we stated to be the aim, alike of analytic psychotherapy and "progressive" sociology.

DIFFICULTIES TO BE ENOUNTERED

But this last parallel, illuminating and hopeful as it might at first appear, is nevertheless calculated to make us realize the great difficulties of the progressive's task. The psycho-analytic process of strengthening the conscious ego of the individual is admittedly both lengthy and laborious. Other difficulties apart, it is clearly impossible to psycho-analyse more than a minute fraction of mankind. Is there then any substitutive process which will make psycho-analytic discoveries available for the general use of mankind—in the same way as that in which the applications of physical discoveries are made available?

This is a question that we cannot answer here. Indeed, psychologists themselves do not know the answer, and a certain pessimism is, perhaps, implied in the present non-committal attitude of most psycho-analytic writers. We can only repeat that there are signs of a more general spread of a psychological attitude in certain directions, and that progressives themselves must see to it that this attitude is fostered. Though there is naturally much ignorance and misunderstanding as to detail, the work of Freud and the other great sexologists of recent years, Havelock Ellis, Magnus Hirschfeld, and the rest, has, beyond all doubt, produced a general attitude of greater sympathy and toleration in the sphere of sex and a greater realization of the enormous scope and urgency of sexual problems.¹ There is, therefore, some reason to hope that, with a wider dissemination of the newer knowledge concerning the psychological basis of human morality, a similar change may come about in regard to our fundamental attitude to reason on the one hand and to tradition on the other, and much of the present resistance to the "progressive" ideal be thereby removed. Just as, with an individual patient, present suffering is a help to understanding and to cure, so also the immense dangers and difficulties with which humanity is faced to-day may make it easier for it to diagnose its own condition. And, although a mere general understanding of psychology will not enable an individual to resolve his own deeper private conflicts, it will yet help him to understand

¹ A startlingly frank, though in some respects naïve, apologia for sex recently published by René Guyon (*Sex Life and Sex Ethics*, 1933) may perhaps compel attention to some problems of sex life that are still inadequately faced.

the psychological troubles of others and of society as a whole.

A VIRTUOUS CIRCLE

Moreover, there is a certain beneficent circularity about the process. Thus a realization of the absurdity of certain fears or prohibitions leads to a freer life and a diminution of frustration, and this in turn may reduce the amount of fear and hatred that have to be dealt with. To what extent a social and educational therapy based on a diminution of frustration will help in lessening our difficulties is still very far from certain,¹ but that some alleviation will be produced by such a means is almost beyond question. Furthermore, the love impulses which, because of their intimate connection with sex, our prevalent moral attitude so largely holds in check, will have a freer outlet both in a sensual and a sublimated form, and will, perhaps, be available in ampler measure for human relationships of the widest and most varied kind; an ideal in propounding which Christ stood out as one of the foremost "progressives" of all time. It is a profoundly tragic fact that, under the present ethical régime, love is often less easy to reconcile with the demands of the super-ego than is hate.

CAN WE FIND AN OUTLET FOR THE ID?

But, however much we reduce frustration, we may be sure that some hatred will remain—engendered

¹ Thus among quite recent psycho-analytically oriented publications Money-Kyrle in his *Aspasia* expresses himself a good deal more optimistically on this point than Glover (*op. cit.*), who stresses the inevitably great frustrations of very early infancy.

by the inevitable privations, disappointments, and humiliations, of even the freest human life. And for this hatred we have to find an outlet. As politicians have always realized, it is a relatively easy matter to produce co-operation and cohesion within a given community by pitting it against another, which thereby becomes the recipient of the collective hate. But the modern progressive does not desire to wage warfare against any of his fellow-men. To some extent he may solve this difficulty by directing the energy of human aggression against Nature, and regarding mankind as a band of brothers courageously fighting with united front against a mighty, callous, and indifferent parent in a struggle in which science is the chief weapon on the human side. But it would seem as though, in this case, we must realize that Nature, our common enemy, is to be found not only without, but within ourselves, in the shape both of primitive a-social impulses, which must be guided into harmless channels, and primitive controlling forces, which check us needlessly and make us incapable of using to advantage the powers and opportunities that we possess. The idea of freedom has aroused mighty efforts and enthusiasms in the past; but the freedom sought has been negative, inasmuch as it aimed only at liberation from external oppressors. Can we arouse an equal enthusiasm for the fight against the internal oppressors that enslave the human mind, by providing for our inevitable hatreds a more enlightened and profitable goal? On this, perhaps, depends, more than we would willingly admit, the ultimate success or failure of the whole "progressive" movement. And in this part of the campaign the chief weapon is psychology.

A P P E N D I X

APPLICATION FOR MEMBERSHIP

NAME¹

(please give name exactly as to be used in addressing, and underline name determining place in files)

ADDRESS.....

Telephone Number: Private..... Business.....

OCCUPATION

SPECIAL SUBJECTS

(a) Interest

(b) Expert Knowledge

PROGRESSIVE SOCIETIES OF
WHICH A MEMBER

OFFER OF WORK (please
state whether willing to
undertake work: see over).....

INTRODUCED BY (not obli-
gatory)

I am in sympathy with the aims of the Federation, of which
I desire to become a member.

I HEREWITH SEND MY MEMBERSHIP SUBSCRIPTION OF.....

Cheques should be made payable to the Federation of Progressive
Societies and Individuals and crossed.

DATE..... Signature.....

The form when completed should be forwarded, with accom-
panying subscription, to the Hon. Secretary, F.P.S.I., Room 21,
St. Stephen's House, Westminster.

¹ Kindly type or print.

OFFER OF ASSISTANCE

(Kindly mark those sections, if any, which you can undertake.)

I. SECRETARIAL.

1. Shorthand Notes at Meetings.
2. Typing.
3. Duplicating.
4. General.

e.g. addressing and preparing envelopes for the post, etc.

Please state exact kind of assistance offered, number of hours per week, and whether work can be done at home, in place of business, or at the F.P.S.I. headquarters.

	Subjects	Area of Activities
II. RESEARCH.		
III. PROPAGANDA.		
1. <i>Speaking.</i>		
(a) Indoor.		
(b) Outdoor.		
2. <i>Writing.</i>		
(a) Articles.		
(b) Letters.		
(c) General.		
(d) Drafts.		
IV. ORGANIZING.		
1. Research Groups.		
2. Study Groups.		
3. Propaganda Groups.		
4. Week-end Schools and Conferences.		
5. Meetings and Demonstrations.		
V. GENERAL.		
1. <i>Lobbying.</i>		
(a) National Authorities.		
(b) Local Authorities.		
2. <i>Pushing Sale of Federation Journal.</i>		
VI. REMARKS.		

Date..... Signature.....

INDEX

- Abercrombie, Patric, 217
Abnormality, sexual, 172, 288
Abortion, 167, 170, 178-179,
 307
Agricultural Marketing Act, 73
Air Force, 120
Air League, 103
Air Transport Union, 102
Aldershot Tattoo, 151
Anderson, A. J., 171
Anschluss, Austro-German,
 99
Army, 51, 53-54, 150-151,
 274
Art, education in, 157-160
Asquith, Earl of Oxford and,
 118
Asquith Government, 46
Assessors, 199, 202
Atheism, 283-284, 306
- Balilla, 91
Bank, International, 78
Bank of International Settlements, 103
Banse, E., 307
Barristers, 189, 200, 203, 272
Bax, Belfort, 283
Bennett, Arnold, 118
Bible, 152, 272-273, 275,
 281-283, 285
Biology, education in, 157-159
Birth control, 170, 172-173,
 177-179, 181, 307
Blasphemy Laws, 281-283
Borstal institutions, 190-192,
 210
Bottomley, Horatio, 118
Boy Scouts, 150
- British Broadcasting Corporation, 283-284
Brown, Monsignor, 171
Buckmaster, Lord, 169
- Cadbury, George, 118
Cadet Corps, 138
Capital punishment, 190, 192,
 205-206
Carlile, Richard, 279
Carson, Lord, 46
Cecil, Viscount, 98
Censorship, 286-288
Central Criminal Court, 186-
 187, 189
Chippendale, 263
Chubb, Sir Lawrence, 220
Church, Established, 60, 152,
 273-275, 278-279
Church, Roman Catholic, 151,
 178, 273, 285, 288-289
Churchill, Winston, 120
Civil Service, 46, 51, 54, 148
Civil Service, International,
 93-94
Claude, 255
Coal Mines Reorganization
 Commission, 73
Cobbett, 217
Common law, 188
Commons, 224
Commons, House of, 51, 118
Communism, 40, 43-44, 56, 60,
 85, 126, 132, 145-146, 161-
 162, 182, 281, 283-284,
 302-303
Communist Manifesto, 47
Conservative Party, 131, 181,
 282, 284

- Convention for Improving
Means of Preventing War, 93
- Cornish, Dr. Vaughan, 225-228
- Corporal punishment, 190,
192, 205, 299-300
- Corridor, Polish, 99
- Cripps, Sir Stafford, 51
- Crown, 46, 51, 273-274, 286-
287
- Cyprus, 100
- Danzig, 99
- Dawson, Lord, 179
- Democracy, 45, 48-53, 264
- Dictatorship, 45-47, 49-53
- Disarmament Commission,
102, 106, 109
- Disarmament Conference, 40,
54, 103, 105
- Disarmament Treaty, World,
105-111
- Discharged prisoners, 193-
194, 212
- Divorce, 167-170, 178-179
- Douglas, James, 288
- Ego, 301-302, 305, 310
- Ellis, Havelock, 311
- Emigration, 70
- Empire League, 103
- Established Church, 60, 152,
273-275, 278-279
- Evelyn, John, 255
- Evidence, rules of, 202
- Fascism, 42, 47, 49, 52, 55,
85, 88, 126, 138, 162, 181,
302-303
- Films, war, 138
- Fines, 206-207
- Free Trade, 73, 78
- Freud, 295, 300-301, 311
- Galileo, 276
- Garden cities, 256-261
- Garvin, J. L., 120
- Geddes, Patric, 217
- George, Lloyd, 116
- Gibraltar, 91
- Glover, Dr. Edward, 136, 307,
312
- Gold Standard, 69
- Grey, Viscount, 116
- Groddeck, 300
- Guchteneere, Dr. R. de, 172
- Guyon, René, 311
- Hailsham, Lord, 107, 109-110
- Haldane, Professor J. B. S.,
284
- Hall, Miss Radclyffe, 288
- Hendon Air Display, 151
- Hirschfeld, Magnus, 311
- Hitler, 40-41, 47, 55-56, 98,
110, 169
- Holyoake, 279
- House of Commons, 51, 118
- House of Lords, 46, 51, 53, 274
- Housman, Laurence, 286
- Howard, Ebenezer, 256-257
- Huxley, Professor J. S., 284
- Ibsen, 286
- Id, 300-301, 304-305, 312
- Independent Labour Party,
134-135
- Individualism, 289
- International Bank, 78
- International Civil Service,
93-94
- International, Second, 52
- International, Third, 52
- Internationalism, 62, 281
- Investment Board, National, 82
- Isaacs, Susan, 296

- Jeans, Sir James, 277
 Judges, 185-187, 190, 194-199, 202, 272
 Juries, 188, 190, 195, 198-199, 202
 Justice, Minister of, 197
 Justices of the Peace, 185-186, 188, 190, 196
- Kellogg Pact, 94-96
 King's Bench Division, 187
 Klein, Melanie, 296
- Labour Government, 46, 282
 Labour Movement, 42, 86
 Labour Party, 47, 133, 282, 284
 La Fontaine, 123
 Lambeth Conference, 170-171
 Laski, Professor, 48
 League of Nations, 88, 93, 96, 101-104, 120, 124-125, 134
 Le Corbusier, 260, 265, 270
 Leisure, education for, 156-157
 Lenin, 281
 Liberals, 60, 133, 282, 284
 Lloyd George, 116
 London Naval Treaty, 88
 Lords, House of, 46, 51, 274
 Lorraine, 255
 Lyttelton, Canon, 172
 Lytton Commission, 102
- Maeterlinck, 286
 Mandates, 92
 Marxists, 290
 Masochism, 299
 Mass production, 71
 Means Test, 46
 Mill, James, 58
 Mill, John Stuart, 58
- Milton, 279
 Minister of Justice, 197
 Minorities, national, 92, 100
 Money-Kyrle, R., 309, 312
 Moore, George, 144
 Morris, William, 217, 262
 Mothers' Union, 169, 178
 Mullins, Claud, 168-171, 178
 Mussolini, 55
- National Birth Control Association, 173
 National Board of Amenity, 228
 National Government, 46
 National Parks, 224-230
 Naval Treaty, London, 88
 Navy, 54, 150, 274
 Navy League, 103
 Nazis, 40, 55-56, 88, 126, 307
 Newspapers, 279-281
 Nichols, Beverley, 42, 138
 Nietzsche, 300
- Oedipus complex, 309
 Officers' Training Corps, 91, 150
 Open Spaces, 219, 223-224, 230-232
 Opium Commission, 102
 Optional Clause, 96
 Owen, Robert, 217
- Parks, National, 224-230
 Peace Act of Parliament, 91
 Peace Treaties, 68, 99
 Permanent Court, 100-101
 Planning Authority, 81-82, 223, 230
 Police, 51, 53-54, 207, 272
 Prison Commission, 197
 Prisoners, discharged, 193-194, 212

- Prisons, 190-193, 197, 205, 207-214, 272
- Probation, 206
- Protection, 73
- Protestants, 285
- Psycho-analysis, 295-313
- Punishment, capital, 190, 192, 205-206
- Punishment, corporal, 190, 192, 205, 299-300
- Punishment, retributive, 203-205
- Puritans, 285, 306, 308
- Rationalists, 278, 284
- Reformation, 285
- Reparations, 68
- Retributive punishment, 203-205
- Richard III, 300
- Roman Catholic Church, 151, 178, 273, 285, 288-289
- Rosa, Salvator, 255
- Rural Amenities Bill, 232
- Ruskin, John, 217
- Russia, Soviet, 55, 77-78, 125, 145-146, 180-182, 212, 285
- Sabbath, 285
- Sadism, 299, 308
- Sassoon, Sir Philip, 120
- Scott, Sir Leslie, 220
- Scripture teaching, 152
- Sex education, 173-177
- Sexual abnormality, 172, 288
- Shakespeare, 42
- Shaw, Bernard, 286, 306
- Simon, Sir John, 120
- Singapore, 91
- Social Democrats, 47, 56
- Socialism, 46-48, 50-54, 57, 74, 182, 281
- Solicitors, 189, 200, 203
- Sophocles, 42
- Southwark, Bishop of, 172
- Soviet Russia, 55, 77-78, 125, 145-146, 180-182, 212, 285
- Stipendiary magistrates, 185-186, 188
- Strachey, John, 42
- Suez Canal, 95
- Sunday, 284-286
- Super-ego, 295-297, 299-302, 304-306, 308, 310, 312
- Tariffs, 71
- Thurtle, Ernest, 282
- Tithes, 274
- Trade Unions, 86
- Treaties, Peace, 68, 99
- Treaty, London Naval, 88
- Treaty, World Disarmament, 105-111
- Unitarians, 282
- Unwin, Sir Raymond, 217
- Vaughan, Father Bernard, 119
- Victoria, Queen, 287
- Voisin Plan, 265, 270
- Voltaire, 278
- White Cross League, 171
- Wild, Sir Ernest, 289
- Wilkes, 279
- William of Orange, 281
- World Currency, 79
- World Disarmament Treaty, 105-111
- World Economic Conference, 78
- World Government, 60-62, 89-90, 103, 149
- Wren, Sir Christopher, 252

